

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION  
of UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS  
**Bulletin**

---

Volume 35

SUMMER 1949

Number 2

---

*Editor*

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD

*Associate Editor*

GEORGE POPE SHANNON

*Editorial Committee*

EDWARD C. KIRKLAND

LOUISE POUND

WILLIAM T. LAPRADE

RICHARD J. PURCELL

*Publication Office:* 20th and Northampton Streets, Easton, Pa. *Editorial Office:* 1101 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Issued quarterly: Spring (March), Summer (June), Autumn (September), and Winter (December). Subscription price (due and payable in advance) is \$3.00 a year, postage free. Foreign subscriptions including Canada are \$5.50 a year. Entered as second-class matter April 24, 1922, at Easton, Pa., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

## OFFICERS AND THE COUNCIL

### PRESIDENT

RALPH H. LUTZ (*History*) Stanford University

### FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

JOHN A. KINNEMAN (*Sociology*) Illinois State Normal University

### SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

MARIE J. WEISS (*Mathematics*) The Tulane University of Louisiana

### GENERAL SECRETARY

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD (*Government, Law*) Washington Office

### ASSOCIATE SECRETARY

GEORGE POPE SHANNON (*English*) Washington Office

### TREASURER

FLORENCE P. LEWIS (*Mathematics*) Goucher College

### TERM MEMBERS

#### 1947-1949

CLARENCE A. BERDAHL ( <i>Political Science</i> )	University of Illinois
EARL CRANSTON ( <i>Religion, History</i> )	University of Southern California
JAMES HOLLADAY ( <i>Banking, Finance</i> )	University of Alabama
O. B. JESNESS ( <i>Agricultural Economics</i> )	University of Minnesota
THEODORE KOPPANYI ( <i>Pharmacology</i> )	Georgetown University
ARTHUR W. MARTIN, JR. ( <i>Physiology</i> )	University of Washington
FRED B. MILLETT ( <i>English, Literature</i> )	Wesleyan University
W. ALBERT NOYES, JR. ( <i>Chemistry</i> )	University of Rochester
GEORGE E. POTTER ( <i>Zoology</i> )	Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas

#### 1948-1950

WILLIAM RAY DENNES ( <i>Philosophy</i> )	University of California
MARY JO FINK ( <i>Romance Languages</i> )	University of Louisville
J. SUTHERLAND FRAME ( <i>Mathematics</i> )	Michigan State College
JAMES A. FUNKHOUSER ( <i>Chemistry</i> )	University of New Hampshire
JAMES HART ( <i>Political Science</i> )	University of Virginia
RICHARD HARTSHORNE ( <i>Geography</i> )	University of Wisconsin
MABEL NEWCOMER ( <i>Economics</i> )	Vassar College
J. RUD NIELSEN ( <i>Physics</i> )	University of Oklahoma
CHESLEY J. POSEY ( <i>Engineering</i> )	State University of Iowa
GEORGE JARVIS THOMPSON ( <i>Law</i> )	Cornell University

#### 1949-1951

MILDRED F. BERRY ( <i>Speech</i> )	Rockford College
WILLIAM H. BROWN ( <i>Zoology</i> )	University of Arizona
ROBERT LOWRY CALHOUN ( <i>Theology</i> )	Yale University
J. WESLEY CHILDERS ( <i>Romance Languages</i> )	New York State College for Teachers (Albany)
TOMLINSON FORT ( <i>Mathematics</i> )	University of Georgia
BENTLEY GLASS ( <i>Biology</i> )	The Johns Hopkins University
JOSEPH W. INCE ( <i>Chemistry</i> )	Rhode Island State College
JOSEPH JAMES IRWIN ( <i>English</i> )	Albion College
EDWIN O. STENE ( <i>Political Science</i> )	University of Kansas
LOWELL O. STEWART ( <i>Civil Engineering</i> )	Iowa State College

### FORMER PRESIDENTS

W. T. LAPRADE ( <i>History</i> )	Duke University
QUINCY WRIGHT ( <i>International Law</i> )	University of Chicago
EDWARD C. KIRKLAND ( <i>History</i> )	Bowdoin College



## CONTENTS

WHAT PRICE FREEDOM? <i>Robert Maynard Hutchins</i> .....	211
THE STATE UNIVERSITY AND THE PUBLIC, <i>Charles L. Mowat</i> ..	216
THE MEANING OF INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM, <i>Elbert D. Thomas</i>	224
A UNIVERSITY TRUSTEE VIEWS THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION, <i>Ora L. Wildermuth</i> .....	233
ANCIENT ANSWERS TO TODAY'S CURRICULUM PROBLEMS, <i>William Charles Korfmacher</i> .....	240
COPYRIGHTS AND THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION, <i>Sam Bass Warner</i> .....	251
THE TROUBLE WITH FRESHMAN COMPOSITION, <i>John B. Virtue</i> .....	259
ECONOMIC DEPENDENTS OF WOMEN FACULTY, <i>Marguerite J. Fisher</i> .....	269
THE RÔLE AND WORK OF UNESCO, <i>Waldo Gifford Leland</i> ..	274
LET'S KICK OUT OUR SOCIALISM, <i>James Urvin Rundle</i> .....	298
ARE WE AFRAID OF FREEDOM? <i>Laird Bell</i> .....	301
FREEDOM AT HARVARD, AN EXCHANGE OF LETTERS.....	313
THE STRANGLEHOLD ON EDUCATION, <i>Harold L. Clapp</i> .....	335
THE TECHNIQUE OF MAKING UNIVERSITY APPOINTMENTS, <i>Ralph C. Epstein</i> .....	349
CENSURED ADMINISTRATIONS.....	357
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS, WHAT IT IS—WHAT IT DOES.....	358
MEMBERSHIP.....	363
ACADEMIC VACANCIES AND TEACHERS AVAILABLE.....	388

Contents of previous issues of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors may be found by consulting the EDUCATION INDEX.

## Contributors to This Issue

**LAIRD BELL** is Chairman of the Board of Trustees of The University of Chicago and of Carleton College and an Overseer of Harvard University. He is the senior member of the law firm of Bell, Boyd, Marshall and Lloyd in Chicago, Illinois.

**HAROLD L. CLAPP** is Professor of Romance Languages, Grinnell College.

**RALPH C. EPSTEIN** is Professor and Head of the Department of Economics, University of Buffalo.

**MARGUERITE J. FISHER** is Associate Professor of Political Science, Syracuse University.

**ROBERT MAYNARD HUTCHINS** is the Chancellor of The University of Chicago.

**WILLIAM CHARLES KORFMACHER** is Professor and Director of the Department of Classical Languages, Saint Louis University.

**WALDO G. LELAND** is a Vice-Chairman of the United States National Commission for UNESCO and Director

Emeritus of the American Council of Learned Societies.

**CHARLES L. MOWAT** is Associate Professor of History, University of California, Los Angeles.

**JAMES URVIN RUNDLE** is Assistant Professor of English, Ohio University.

**ELBERT D. THOMAS** is the Senior Senator from Utah, Chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

**JOHN B. VIRTUE** is Associate Professor of English, Michigan State Normal College.

**SAM BASS WARNER** is the United State Register of Copyrights, Library of Congress.

**ORA L. WILDERMUTH** is President of the Board of Trustees of Indiana University and Secretary of the Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions. He is a member of the law firm of Wildermuth, London, and Nehrig in Gary, Indiana.

## WHAT PRICE FREEDOM?<sup>1</sup>

By ROBERT MAYNARD HUTCHINS

The University of Chicago

We hear on every side that the American Way of Life is in danger. I think it is. I also think that many of those who talk the loudest about the dangers to the American Way of Life have no idea what it is and consequently no idea what the dangers are that it is in.

You would suppose, to listen to these people, that the American Way of Life consisted in unanimous tribal self-adoration. Down with criticism; down with protests; down with unpopular opinions; down with independent thought. Yet the history and tradition of our country make it perfectly plain that the essence of the American Way of Life is its hospitality to criticism, protest, unpopular opinions, and independent thought. A few dates like 1620, 1776, and 1848 are enough to remind us of the motives and attitudes of our ancestors. The great American virtue was courage.

We ought to be afraid of some things. We ought to be afraid of being stupid and unjust. We are told that we must be afraid of Russia, yet we are busily engaged in adopting the most stupid and unjust of the ideas prevalent in Russia, and are doing so in the name of Americanism. The worst Russian ideas are the police state, the abolition of freedom of speech, thought, and association, and the notion that the individual exists for the state. These ideas are the basis of the cleavage between East and West.

Yet every day in this country men and women are being deprived of their livelihood, or at least their reputation, by unsubstantiated charges. These charges are then treated as facts in further charges against their relatives or associates. We do not throw people into jail because they are alleged to differ with the official dogma. We

<sup>1</sup> Address given at the 237th Convocation of The University of Chicago, June 17, 1949.

throw them out of work and do our best to create the impression that they are subversive and hence dangerous, not only to the state, but also to everybody who comes near them.

The result is that every public servant must try to remember every tea party his wife has gone to in the past ten years and endeavor to recall what representatives of which foreign powers she may have met on these occasions. A professor cannot take a position on any public question without looking into the background of everybody who may be taking the same position on the same question. If he finds that any person who is taking the same position on this question has been charged with taking an unpopular position on another question, the professor had better not take any position on this question, or he may be haled before some committee to explain himself.

## II

Is this the American Way of Life? The great American word is freedom, and, in particular, freedom of thought, speech, and assembly. Asserting the dignity of man, and of every man, America has proclaimed and protected the freedom to differ. Each man is supposed to think for himself. The sum of the thoughts of all is the wisdom of the community. Difference, disagreement, discussion decided by democratic processes are required to bring out the best in the citizens. America has grown strong on criticism. It would be quite as consistent with the American Way of Life to offer prizes for the most penetrating criticism of our country as it would be to offer prizes to those who have done the best job of advertising it.

The heart of Americanism is independent thought. The cloak-and-stiletto work that is now going on will not merely mean that many persons will suffer for acts that they did not commit, or for acts that were legal when committed, or for no acts at all. Far worse is the end result, which will be that critics, even of the mildest sort, will be frightened into silence. Stupidity and injustice will go unchallenged because no one will dare to speak against them. To persecute people into conformity by the nonlegal methods popular today is little better than doing it by purges and pogroms. The dreadful unanimity of tribal self-adoration was characteristic

of a Nazi state. It is sedulously fostered in Russia. It is to the last degree un-American.

American education has not been constructed on such un-American principles. In general, the practice has been to give the student the facts, to try to help him learn to think, and to urge him to reach his own conclusions. It is not surprising that the heart of American education is the same as that of Americanism: it is independent thought. American education has not tried to produce indoctrinated automatons, but individuals who can think, and who will think always for themselves. The basic principle of American government, and one that accounts for the importance of education in this country, is that if the citizens learn to think and if they will think for themselves, the Republic is secure. The basic principle of the Russian dictatorship is that the people cannot think or cannot be trusted to think for themselves.

The American doctrine rests on the proposition that it is the individual in himself that counts. It is not who his father was, or how much money he has, or what his color or creed is, or what party he belongs to, or who his friends are, but who and what he is. So the test of a teacher is whether he is competent. The professional competence of a teacher is hardly a question on which lay bodies, or even administrators or trustees, would wish to pass without the advice of persons professionally competent in the teacher's field.

If we apply any other test than competence in determining the qualifications of teachers we shall find that pressures and prejudice will determine them. In 1928 it was said that Al Smith could not be President because he would be subservient to a foreign power; and today in many places, and if not today it may happen tomorrow, anti-Catholic or anti-Jewish campaigns may mean that teachers who belong to those churches will not be able to practice their profession.

Teachers may be expected to obey the law of the land. But it is still permissible, I hope, to ask whether a law is wise. To discriminate against teachers—to act as though they were all disloyal—and to put them under special legal disabilities seems injudicious if we want able, independent men to go into the teaching profession.

## III

The assumption appears to be that American education is full of Reds, an assumption that is the precise reverse of the truth. All the excitement of the last few years, all the hearings, investigations, and publicity releases have not turned up more than four or five Communist professors, even though membership in the Party has been perfectly legal up to now. To require oaths of loyalty from all because of the eccentricity of an infinitesimal minority is an unnecessary and derogatory act. And of course it will not effect any useful purpose; for teachers who are disloyal will certainly be dishonest; they will not shrink from a little perjury.

The way to fight ideas is to show that you have better ideas. No idea is any good unless it is good in a crisis. You demonstrate the failure of your ideas if, when the crisis comes, you abandon them or lose faith in them or get confused about them to the point of forgetting what they are. The American idea is freedom. Freedom necessarily implies that the *status quo* may come under the criticism of those who think it can be improved. The American idea is that the state exists for its citizens and that change in society must occur to meet their developing needs. The whole theory of our form of government is a theory of peaceful change. Many of the changes that Marx and Engels demand in the Communist Manifesto have taken place in this country, and they have taken place without communism, without dictatorship, and without revolution, thus disproving, incidentally, one of the central theses of Marx and Engels, that such things cannot be accomplished without communism, dictatorship, and revolution.

These reflections on the Communist Manifesto lead me to say that labeling some thing or some man communist because communists happen to favor it or agree with him, that easy process by which one disposes of different views by applying a dirty name to them, involves the negation of thought of any kind. If it had been applied consistently in American history it would have deprived us of some ideas and some men that we are proud to think characteristically American. For example, the Communist Manifesto demands free education for all. Are we therefore to recant, and renounce the American doctrine of free education for all?

And what would the F.B.I. say of Thomas Jefferson, who calmly remarked in his First Inaugural, "If there be any among us who wish to dissolve this union, or change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed, as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it"?

Jefferson was not in favor of revolution; he was serene in the face of talk of it because he had confidence in our people, in our institutions, in democracy, and in the value, power, and results of independent thought.

We are now in the midst of a cold war. We must protect ourselves against external enemies, their representatives in this country, and any citizens who may be conspiring to overthrow or betray the government. But the statute books are already filled with laws directed to these ends. It has never been shown that there are so many spies or traitors in this country, or that the external danger is so great and imminent that we have to divert the entire attention of our people into one great repressive preoccupation, into one great counterrevolution in which the freedoms of our citizens must be thrown overboard as too burdensome for the floundering ship of state to carry.

It is useful to remember that Jefferson spoke in 1801, when our Constitution was twelve years old, and when the infant republic was in dreadful danger from deep divisions within and from the wars that were raging between the great powers. If he was right in speaking in such a way at such a time, we cannot be far wrong if now, when America is the most powerful nation on earth, we seek to recapture some of his sanity and courage.

How is the educated man to show the fruits of his education in times like these? He must do it by showing that he can and will think for himself. He must keep his head, and use it. He must never push other people around, nor acquiesce when he sees it done. He must struggle to retain the perspective and the sense of proportion that his studies have given him and decline to be carried away by waves of hysteria. He must be prepared to pay the penalty of unpopularity. He must hold fast to his faith in freedom. He must insist that freedom is the chief glory of mankind and that to repress it is in effect to repress the human spirit.



## THE STATE UNIVERSITY AND THE PUBLIC<sup>1</sup>

By CHARLES L. MOWAT

University of California, Los Angeles

These are times which try men's souls—more, perhaps, than times of war. For we are in an era of fear, of the cold war, when we have become so afraid of Russia and of communism that we are in great danger of destroying our liberties in the process of preventing others from doing it for us. All ideas that diverge from those of the *status quo* become dangerous; reaction, not reform, will alone avert catastrophe. In such times, the ivory tower may prove to be a sham castle, like the "follies" with which eighteenth-century magnates liked to adorn their estates in England. Universities may lose some of their freedom, if indeed they have not already done so. Discoveries of atomic energy and of bacteriological warfare have already curtailed the natural scientist's freedom of research and discussion, and limited the exchange of ideas essential to scientific progress. The social scientist is in equal danger; he must be wary in his discussion of socialism or communism, for our youth must be kept pure from such things, and not inoculated against them—pure, and so the more likely to fall ready victims to the first slick exponent of dialectic materialism they meet. Soon, no doubt, the artists and musicians will find their shoptalk under the ban for some supposedly revolutionary implications of modern art and music.

There is nothing very new in this. To have ideas is to invite criticism and even suppression, as Abélard and Galileo found long ago. A university, as a community of teachers and students seeking the truth out of the conflict of ideas, seeking it in discussion and research which generates ideas, is merely in greater danger than the individual thinker because the scale of its work, and the range of its

<sup>1</sup> Based on a talk given at a meeting of the Chapter of the American Association of University Professors at the University of California, Los Angeles, on April 19, 1949.



influence, are larger. Yet it cannot dispense with ideas and live; it may ultimately have to face the choice between dying because denied the freedom to seek and discuss ideas, or living at the price of such a suppression of its freedom as will make it intellectually dead.

For a university is not only a community of scholars; it is also a social institution, operating in society and subject to social pressures. This is hardly less true of a private university than of a state university. Any university must be regarded as a most hazardous undertaking; and a state university most of all. For the state, in founding and maintaining a university, is supporting an institution where ideas may be generated and whence ideas may spread—including, possibly, ideas thought dangerous by many of the citizens whose taxes, whether they like it or not, are helping to maintain it. Whether the founders of state universities realized this is not clear; the state university in this country owed its existence to two forces: the militant belief of hardy frontiersmen that even in the wilderness there must be institutions to carry forward the education which was so essential a part of the culture of the older communities from which they came, and the shrewd notion that only the state had the necessary resources, in a pioneer society, to do this. As it was, they were doing something of which many must have disapproved; for they were creating an institution where men would lead, amidst a busy, hard-working community, a life of apparent leisure, and would receive payment, albeit modest, out of public funds, for the purpose.

Still, what the professors did with their time would hurt no one: the teaching and reading of the literature of Greece and Rome, Italy and France, the study of law and medicine, the training of men and women for teaching, and of men for the ministry (even if actual theological instruction was, of necessity, given elsewhere). The state university of the nineteenth century was either a small, liberal arts college of classical cast, harmless to the many, a glowing lantern of inspiration for the few, or it was a college of the agricultural and mechanical arts, whose usefulness and guilelessness were apparent to all. Not so the mighty and expensive giants of today. Their curriculum includes subjects not studied, and hardly even named, a century ago: economics, sociology, industrial relations,

to name a few closely, and dangerously, bound up with everyday life. Marxism is bound to rear its head in many courses, as one of the major phenomena of our times. Wherever our work touches contemporary society we expose ourselves to criticism, from one side or another, and for what we omit as much as for what we say. How much freedom ought we to have? How much can we expect?

## II

The problem is one of control. How should a university be governed? Universities, when they first came into being in the middle ages, were governed by their students or by their faculties, more usually the latter. The university was a guild, similar to the guilds of weavers and saddlers and pewterers and the rest in the towns; those members who had advanced in learning and shown, by defense of a thesis under examination, a mastery of the subject similar to the skill shown by the weaver's masterpiece of cloth were admitted masters of arts by the existing masters and were licensed to teach, thus becoming partners in the control of the university just as the master-weavers controlled their guild. In days when no buildings were needed other than a few rooms for lectures, and when scholars could support themselves on the small fees they collected from students attending their lectures, so simple a form of government sufficed. It has survived, in essentials, to this day at Oxford and Cambridge, and exists in large part in the other British universities; and even the vastly increased grants to the universities from the British government, supplementing the income from endowments and fees, have not led to control from outside.

In the United States such a state of affairs has never existed. Harvard and other colleges of colonial days were, from the start, placed under boards of overseers since, at first, there was no staff of teachers to which the government of the college could be entrusted. It was intended that, when the minority was over, the college should become of age and be managed, on the English model, by its president and fellows; but the transfer of power was never made, and the pattern of control by an outside board became

fixed and irrevocable.<sup>1</sup> When state universities were created it was natural that an intermediate body, the board of regents, should be set between the legislature and the faculties to receive public funds, to choose the president, and to manage the university generally. To have put control in the hands of the professors, who would then have been responsible for the disbursing of the moneys out of which they themselves were paid, would have been unthinkable. The device of a board of regents was inevitable, and better far than direct control by the legislature.

In the main, the system has worked well. Members of state universities, both teachers and students, have enjoyed great freedom, and have been shielded, by the board of regents and the status of the university as an independent corporation within the government of the state, from many of the pressures from outside. Regents, usually appointed or reappointed for fairly long terms, have generally been men of substance and of cultivated interests, with a strong sense of the greatness of the trust which is theirs and with the independence to uphold it worthily, often at great cost to their time and energy, and perhaps, occasionally, to their private beliefs also. Under them, and with the generosity of state appropriations, universities have been able to grow greatly not only in size, but in the range and depth of their studies; they have done much good, even if sometimes by stealth. The good will created by the College of Agriculture (and perhaps the football team) has carried much else along, and the regents, with a large block grant to apportion, have been able to foster a freedom of research and teaching which legislators might have found, in some of its applications, a little disturbing.

Today, conditions are changing. The breath of outside pressures is hot on our necks. Universities are more than ever in the public eye and the public domain. The purposes of the university, the very conditions without which it cannot exist, are misunderstood or forgotten; outside criticism threatens to strangle its freedom, and boards of regents may be unable, sometimes even unwilling, to protect it. What is needed is a clear understanding

<sup>1</sup> George G. Bogert, "Faculty Participation in American University Government," *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, Spring, 1945, Vol. XXXI, No. 1, pp. 72-82.

of what the state university is entitled to expect from its public if it is to be true to itself; and means by which it may bring about that understanding.

### III

What the university needs is simple enough: freedom of research and of discussion and debate. This freedom, at least as it relates to "academic" subjects discussed within the classroom, is, in general, not threatened; but it comes in question at many points, and particularly over meetings of students, or public lectures by outside speakers, where controversial subjects of contemporary, political interest are discussed. Yet undergraduates are at the time of life when they are beginning to inquire most eagerly about the world around them, and to discuss its institutions and its ideas in their own way, which is apt to be direct, even crude, and radical. This is well understood by anyone who remembers his own youth, but persons in authority have sometimes forgotten it. To satisfy such people, an invisible line is sometimes premised, and what happens beyond it, at meetings of students across the street, "off campus," is said to be outside the university, and beyond praise or blame to it. There is apt to be an element of hypocrisy in this, and in a residential university, with many dormitories where students are bound to meet together for other things besides meals, even this resource may not exist. It might be better to admit that students will be students, and to permit them to hear and debate about public issues on the campus rather than behind the barn. Oxford has for years tolerated, as an officially recognized undergraduate society, the October Club, whose crimson posters have advertised its communist meetings without subverting the university; and when, in 1933, a debate in the Oxford Union ended in the resolution of the majority not to fight for King and country, there was much fluttering in dovecots, and many letters to the *Times*, but no one expected undergraduates to be expelled, or dons to be censured, or the country to be ruined, as a result.

This is putting an extreme case, inconceivable here; our sense of humor is different from the English. There remains the need to explain to the public the freedom of discussion which ought to

exist in the university without questions of the loyalty or the "competence" of the faculty being raised. How is the university to be put in the right relation to the public, and the public be persuaded to leave it the freedom which, so far, the public has not hesitated to accord it?

First, it is clear that the president and other officers of administration should use every occasion to speak out before the public in explanation of what the university is, what it exists for, and what freedom it must have if it is to serve the state and people properly. Particularly when a challenge to this freedom arises should they speak out, not seeking trouble, nor yet running away from it. Every seeming surrender of freedom disheartens those people of liberal outlook in the state—and they are not few—and sacrifices their support without placating those who can never be placated, the sworn enemies of the university's freedom. It need hardly be said that administrative officers will be firmer in their defense of freedom, and members of the faculty more understanding in their advocacy of it, if there is full and continuous cooperation between the two, each taking the other into confidence over this, the supreme question facing the university.

The regents of a state university will, however, be the most important defenders of its freedom, less in public than in their private decisions, their continuous, unacknowledged denial of requests for interference from outside, their silent support for men or activities under attack. It may be that some boards are too remote from the public, particularly its more liberal elements, and should be made more representative of all parts of the community, including organized labor and the professions. Yet they should not be too close to the people, too representative, lest they become battle-grounds of faction and of passing intolerances. One element vitally concerned in the university is, however, always absent from the deliberations of the board of regents: the faculty. It would be well if the point of view of the faculty could be put by faculty representatives named to the board as nonvoting members, as is the case at Cornell University. If the alumni can be represented on the board, then why not...?

How to influence state legislatures when matters concerning the state university are under consideration is a more difficult question,

even without laws and customs which rightfully discourage lobbying. Sometimes one feels that no one is more remote from ordinary people (though not from special interests) than the average state assemblyman. It would be well if he could meet a few professors and students in the flesh, and come to realize that they are ordinary, decent people concerned, as he claims to be, with the welfare of the state as a whole. Perhaps the university might occasionally send such a delegation to the capitol, to supplement the representations of the president and the legislative counsel.

The alumni of a state university should be among the strongest defenders of its freedom, ready at all times to speak out in its defense, and not to join in the shortsighted or malicious attacks upon it which may be made by others. They, having experienced the university's freedom and stimulus, and knowing what students and professors are like, should be able to argue for their *alma mater* with skill and conviction; and they are bound to include all walks of life, a cross section of the state's population—even if their alumni association may, in some cases, be controlled by a rather small and one-sided group. The university often looks to its wealthier alumni for financial support; the moral support of the entire body is a much richer and more enduring prize, if it can be won.

The students present at the university are apt to be forgotten by the faculty when the defense of academic freedom is in question, though many of the students themselves are far from oblivious to such matters, as the pages of the campus newspaper may well testify. Student journalists often employ a vigor and directness, and a readiness to name names, in defending the university and attacking its enemies, which alternately gladden and appall the faculty and the administration. Some of the diatribes are not disinterested; others are not discreet. The good will of students, however, could be made of immense value, in the university town, in their home towns, among their parents and friends, if there were more consultation between students and faculty over the freedom of the university; their influence could be made as helpful as it is now at times harmful, in representing the university to the public.

For it is the public that, finally, must be reached, and be made to see and support what the university must be. Some state univer-



sities have been more successful than others in making themselves a part of the state, in being the university of all the people. All must strive for this, and must claim a freedom of discussion, a variety of ideas as diverse as are the people of the state. In particular, they must make it clear, in season and out of season, that there is no real distinction between academic freedom and the freedom of the citizen in general; an attack on the freedom of the university is an attack on the freedom of all people, on their civil liberties, their freedom of opinion and debate—in fact the first, if successful, will certainly be followed by the second.

The university needs, in fact, two things which may seem contradictory: calm, for dispassionate contemplation, and participation to the full in the life of the times, and support in and from that life. It needs both the seclusion of the ivory tower, and a stand in the market place, amid the busy throngs of men. This may seem much to ask. Can we ask for anything less, and still be true to ourselves and to our calling?

# THE MEANING OF INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM<sup>1</sup>

By ELBERT D. THOMAS

United States Senate

I am glad that our Toastmaster mentioned my subject because it is likely that when you leave here you may have forgotten or may never have discovered what I was talking about. I am not going to talk about free will or determinism as some of my faculty colleagues at the University of Utah were wont to do when they spoke of freedom. With the philosophical aspect of freedom I am not concerned this evening. I propose merely to talk in reference to freedom as that concept is understood by laymen in special reference to intellectual freedom.

Any kind of freedom—political, religious, economic, or intellectual—may be dangerous. For this reason the concept of freedom has never been accepted as an absolute even by people who have achieved the maximum of freedom. In the nature of the case there must be some bounds to freedom in reason and in law to the end that the exercise of freedom may not become license to the detriment of the general welfare.

## II

The potentialities of the human mind are great and unpredictable. Experience shows that many things which men said could not be done have been done because someone, believing they could be done, found a way of doing them through application of the mind.

Man's mind may be stimulated to action in unexpected ways. The great Arctic explorer, Peary, was the man who first aroused in

<sup>1</sup> Address delivered at the Annual Dinner, on February 26, 1949, of the Thirty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors, held in Washington, D. C., at the Hotel Statler, February 26-27, 1949.



me an interest in aviation. He did it by explaining how much could be done by the mere directional freedom an airplane has over anything that moves on the surface of the earth. I accepted his thesis as truth and from that day many years ago I was confident men would ultimately fly. Then I read an article which said that men would be able to fly, but that they never would because while they could get off the ground, they would never be able to land again and remain alive. Thus, in my mind flying became not a problem of getting up in the air and staying there, but getting back again if flying were to become possible. At length a machine was devised in which a person could get up in the air, stay up, and come down again safely. Despite this great achievement little was being done to develop aviation, and I felt that if aviation were to be developed it was essential to give government a sanction to go into this field with a strong and vigorous program. With this thought in mind I introduced the Army Air Base Bill. This idea met with no enthusiasm in the Army generally. The military leaders said that aviation could never be more than an auxiliary force. Six years later we found ourselves in the Second World War. Under the stress of war aviation developed rapidly.

It is ironic that the inventiveness and resourcefulness of the human mind are so much in evidence under the stress of war and so little in evidence during periods of peace. War does remove lethargy from the minds of men, and has thereby contributed to some of the greatest discoveries and developments of science and administration. One illustration will show how the stress of war stimulates ideas. At the beginning of our participation in the Second World War we were building planes, taking them apart, packing them in crates, and shipping them abroad. When the planes arrived they had to be taken out of their crates and put together again before they could fly. It was at this time that I pointed out in a speech in the Senate how wars in the past have been won by new ideas, and I suggested that from that time on one of our slogans for victory should be "Airplanes directly from the factory to the battlefields." The "practical minded"—the men-in-the-know and many newspaper editorial writers—discounted the idea. However, it was not long before we were flying the planes from the factory to the battlefields and landing at airports which

were built solely for ferrying purposes. This came about because an individual stimulated by an obvious need had permitted his mind to wander into an area where he could not qualify as an "expert."

Now I do not know how to fly. I have never been interested in aviation from either a scientific or a personal standpoint. The dominant interests in my life have been history and government, but it has long been my conviction that there is danger in extreme specialization. The ideas of an untrained outsider may be as helpful as those of the trained specialists. There must, therefore, always be freedom of the mind, enough at least to restrain the "experts" from disregarding all ideas excepting those which come from their own caste thinking and experience. Caste thinking produces good Brahmins, but it is not conducive to democratic achievement. This thought should be kept in mind in considering the current Science Foundation Bill. Those supporters of the Bill who would exclude from its operation the social sciences are, in my opinion, shortsighted. If the exact sciences are to contribute to the ultimate good of mankind their development must be in relation to the needs of society. I am utterly opposed to letting the "practical," the specially trained, those who insist that they "know from experience," be the sole rulers of the world.

As a student of history I have always been interested in the motivation for inventions that have contributed to the development of our culture and civilization. Take for example the loud-speaker for radio. I have been told that the idea of the loud-speaker for radio came from the mind of one who believed in the "second coming" so literally that he wrote that if the Master were to come again, he would want to speak to all the people in the world; therefore, something should be done to make it possible.

### III

Now, intellectual freedom may have some unhappy results. It may be disquieting and may bring inconvenience and discomfort. The technique which man discovered and developed to reproduce voices from all parts of the world has probably brought as much confusion to man's thinking as it has contributed to clarity of

thinking, and as much discomfort as comfort. It has been said that Mr. Edison, when told that he could probably invent a device that would offset his deafness, decided that deafness was not so bad for his purposes. Many a time as a missionary, when carrying a message which I firmly believed to be the truth, I was aware that anyone who accepted this message would never again have the kind of peace of mind he had had before. Truth in the guise of a new idea may be very upsetting, but as long as the human mind functions truth will never be ultimately established and intellectual freedom will never contribute to placidity. Those who believe in intellectual freedom are not seekers of placidity.

In discussing freedom it should be clearly understood that by definition freedom does not mean license even in the realm of the expression of thought. Considerations of the general welfare must always determine the extent of and the occasion for the exercise of this freedom. But after these considerations have been observed there are still some risks to freedom. For this reason there are many in all lands who are afraid of intellectual freedom. The exercise of this freedom tends to bring about change which many fear because it may affect their own activities and their own economic and social status. Such persons wish merely to be free to continue to do the things they are accustomed to doing in their own accustomed way. Throughout the whole of Christendom the Lord's Prayer, suggesting the coming of the Master's Kingdom, is repeated but many who offer this prayer do so in the faith that the Master's Kingdom will not come until after next Thursday because if it should come sooner it would seriously interfere with their business, professional, and social relationships and activities.

Freedom of mind is particularly difficult to maintain when the attention of men is concentrated on the day-to-day solution of practical problems. In my own State of Utah it took us nearly seventy-five years to appreciate the beauties of our canyons. The mind does not detach itself to consider the worth of scenery when men are seeking a spot to plant needed food. A medieval monk, as he travelled on his way through the Alps, thought so much about heaven that he did not notice earth, except once in a while to execrate the difficult roads or express his impatience when his donkey was exhausted. Thinking through and analyzing present-

day problems is harder than writing Utopias. It is easier to hold out the hope of heaven than to correct the errors of earth. Fighting the devil seems to be no great hazard if we may judge from health and accident premiums: a minister of the Gospel gets the lowest rate.

It is hard to get a new idea. It is harder still to express it. It is harder than that to get it published. But the hardest of all hard things is to get someone else to accept a new idea. All thoughtful persons condemn what we call sloganized thinking. But thinking in and of itself is not enough; it is the slogan that puts the thought over. So any way we consider it, the operation of the mind has its dangers and difficulties.

#### IV

During the war I was Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate. There came over my desk every day ideas for the winning of the war. Hardly a day went by in which I did not send some of these ideas to the Committee to consider their possible usefulness. One day I received in the mail a mathematical formula, and I could not help but laugh. I said, "Here is a fellow who thinks he is going to win the war by a formula." Later I heard of Mr. Einstein's explaining to the President what he had worked out. Had the other fellow's mathematical formula been brought to me by Mr. Einstein personally, rather than coming through the mail from a man I had never heard of, it might have had a better chance of impressing me. My reaction in this matter illustrates a significant question: Are we big enough to lay aside the notion that there is an aristocracy of good thinking? We are all full of the notion that there is an aristocracy of good thinking—an aristocracy which alone has a right to good and new ideas. When I go back over the suggestions for curing the depression I am amazed at how many were just as practical as anything we actually tried; and these suggestions came from common men. It is surprising to know how many of the ideas that actually were successful came from ordinary men.

I believe in the democratization of education. I was one of the three authors of a soldier education bill, which later became a part

of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, generally known as the G. I. Bill of Rights. This was one of the greatest governmental acts in educational history. I would like to tell you as educators how this bill began. I was present one day when some people were trying to tell President Roosevelt how France fell and why England found herself in a terrible position. After they had spoken, I said that I did not agree with them. "France," I said, "fell because the French Government failed to produce leadership to replace the men who were destroyed in the First World War. England is in her present predicament for the same reason, and, Mr. President, if we don't begin thinking about the leadership of the next generation, we too are going to slip back." "Give me your ideas," said the President.

As a result this bill for soldier education was written. While the provisions of this bill, which are now a part of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, benefit the individual veteran, it was not introduced for that purpose. It was introduced for the benefit of America and all of the American people. It was based on the idea that America cannot afford to neglect leadership in any single generation, because our American democracy depends absolutely and entirely upon intelligent and trained citizenship. I spoke of the soldier education bill at the last international conference I attended, and I mentioned that it would create two million-odd leaders. Thinking that the whole world understood what American democracy meant and what it required, I spoke with enthusiasm, with the expectation of audience approval; but when I concluded a leader of one of the finest oligarchies in the world asked, "What is America going to do with all her leaders?"

There are still many people in the world who have no concept of what American democracy means and of conditions necessary for our democracy. I do not profess to be able to give a complete definition; to me, American democracy is still a hope, an aspiration, and in no sense a fulfillment. But I remember writing something during Hitler's first year wherein I said, "Hitler removes the responsibility for thinking from the people. He knows what is for their good and they leave it to him. But that is not the way free men live and work." The weakness of the German people under this system was shown later; for when Hitler fell the German

people fell, and they are today still without leadership. Above all things, intellectual freedom means that there is no place for a single will in the state, in any association, or in any group. It may be hard for us to see sometimes, but to those who observe thoughtfully the development of man in civilization, it is crystal clear that if men are to be men, freedom means everything.

We say now that Washington was great because he was not afraid of counsel and discussion; in fact, he went out of his way to seek it. When members of groups, labor unions, employer associations, or even the Congress of the United States find themselves in the midst of discussions, sometimes individual argument and the discussion itself slips to a level which makes no one proud. But even discussion of that kind is worth while because it evidences democracy at work. Out of it come unity, stability, and development which reflect our democracy: unity and stability that are genuine because they represent a consensus. This we call freedom of speech. It is much more than that. It is man learning how to live with his fellow men, learning how to reason out his problems, and learning how to gain understanding. As a result of talk comes real deliberation, and as a result of deliberation mighty things sometimes come.

One illustration will suffice. During a long tedious evening session of the United States Senate I got an idea. I wrote the idea on a slip of paper and took it over and showed it to Senator Norris. The idea was simple—namely, that if we were going to call men from their work for war service we should give them back their jobs when they got through with this service. Senator Norris looked at it, laughed, and said, "That's a good idea but it is so patently unconstitutional that we can't do anything with it." After what Norris had said, I went home and stayed up nearly all night writing a constitutional defense of this new idea. I defended it under "war powers" which are always in the process of definition. I presented it as an amendment the next day. This amendment was adopted and no one has ever questioned its constitutionality and I doubt that any one will ever do so. It has become a part of our national life. Perhaps this explains why it is that there have not been the listlessness, the restlessness, and the unemploy-



ment of the returned soldier from this war that there were after the First World War.

## V

I know what a new idea can do to and for a community, a state, and a country, and I know what it can do to and for an individual. I know also that new ideas do not come easily. We should, therefore, always strive for new ideas and should have the freedom to express them. But we must never forget that the general welfare requires that intellectual honesty be a concomitant of intellectual freedom, and that if we have discovered what we regard to be a new truth we must think through to the consequences before presenting it. One cannot say "Here is some truth I have found" and wash one's hands of it. I am one of the sponsors of a National Science Foundation. The idea of such a foundation was new. Yesterday I succeeded in getting the National Science Foundation Bill out of Committee a third time after five or six different compromises. It is going to the floor of the Senate, it is ultimately going to pass, and the President is going to sign it. We are going to have a National Foundation of Science, the purpose of which is to apply to the problems of peace the same methods which were found so effective in coping with the problems of war. Although this plan has general approval some objections are heard. Some exact scientists say that the social sciences should have no place in the work of the Foundation and that the social sciences have no place in scientific study. To these objections I say that unless we can think through the social consequences of everything envisioned in the work of the Foundation, the results may well be inimical to mankind. The social sciences will find a high place in the National Science Foundation. I and the other sponsors of the Foundation know, of course, what some Members of the Congress are afraid of in the social sciences. We are not afraid of biology or of geology, although we used to be. We are not afraid of astronomy or of chemistry, although we used to be. We still have fears about economics and are very much afraid of sociology. We are even afraid of political science, the science upon which we depend for our stability. Basic in these fears is the fear of change, but basic in

a democratic society is change accomplished by the orderly process of deliberation in the light of facts found.

## VI

What we are concerned with might well be called man's free agency. The scope of man's free agency can never be wider than the bounds of his political, economic, and educational environment. In a democratic society the bounds of freedom are determined not alone by constitutional provisions; to a much greater extent they are determined by public opinion. To achieve freedom the public must believe in freedom. Resistance to new ideas is usually but a manifestation of the fear of change. Timidity in presenting new ideas is usually a manifestation of the fear of the possibility of majority disapproval. If we as a people can free ourselves of the fear of change and as individuals of the fear of majority disapproval, we shall soon achieve real freedom and with it the stability inherent in freedom. A discouraging manifestation today is that so many are motivated by fear. There are many who cite with approval the martyrdom of Socrates but who refuse to support new ideas which they have indicated they believe to be sound because of the fear of majority disapproval. But the need for the advancement of truth is as great today as it was in the days of Socrates and the advancement of truth today calls for the same courage of the martyrs of history. This fact must be reckoned with by anyone who accepts the invitation to intellectual freedom.



## A UNIVERSITY TRUSTEE VIEWS THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION<sup>1</sup>

By **ORA L. WILDERMUTH**

Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and  
Allied Institutions

Before undertaking to outline a trustee's view of the academic profession I should like to set before you the position from which I do the viewing, and the relationship which we trustees bear to the profession in the institutions with which I am familiar. I speak solely from the standpoint of a member of a governing board of a public institution of higher learning. I do not undertake to speak from the standpoint of a trustee of the privately endowed or church-related schools.

First, I should like to sketch briefly the history and purposes of the Association of which I am Secretary; and second, to point out briefly the underlying principles in the organization of the public universities.

The idea of an organization of governing boards of State universities and allied institutions was conceived at the University of Michigan in 1922 at the inauguration of Dr. Marion LeRoy Burton as President. Mr. Junius Beal, a regent of that University for many years, was instrumental in having a number of trustees and representatives of Middle Western State universities invited to the ceremonies. They quite naturally herded together, and they talked of such an organization. A committee was appointed to study the matter, with authority to call a meeting the next year for formal organization. The committee decided that such an association was desirable, drafted a constitution, and called a meeting to be held in Chicago in the Fall of 1923. The members of this committee apparently felt that it would be unwise for

<sup>1</sup> Address delivered at the Annual Dinner on February 26, 1949, of the Thirty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors, held in Washington, D. C., at the Hotel Statler, February 26-27, 1949.

trustees to depart too far from the apron strings of their preceptors, their presidents; so this meeting in 1923 was held at the same time in an adjoining room in the same hotel where the National Association of State Universities met. Here the Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions was formally organized.

The purpose of the founders was to provide a means whereby university trustees could meet, discuss their common problems, avoid repetition of mistakes, and better equip themselves to discharge their duties. The Association has met every year since then, all but once at some member institution. From a membership of some twenty institutions it has grown until its membership now includes the boards of more than a hundred State universities and colleges, representative of every State in the Union save five.

I should like to outline briefly the principles of university management in America as compared with European and Asiatic institutions. In general, the universities and colleges of Europe and the Near East have been and now are governed by a committee of the Faculty, often called the Senate. This committee is elected by the Faculty as a whole and its members are of the Faculty. It elects the President, appoints the Faculty, determines the curriculum and policies, and in general manages the university.

For some reason, I do not know why, in the United States from a very early date it became the custom to entrust university control to lay boards. Practically all our State-supported institutions of higher learning are thus controlled. The lay board is so universal and so thoroughly established in America as to make discussion of the relative merits of the two systems largely academic.

Briefly, may I outline the duties of governing boards of State universities. These boards were all established, and their powers, duties and responsibilities fixed, either by the statutory law of the State or by the State Constitutions, but some of them are departments of the State. Some of these corporations are constitutional corporations—that is, corporations created by the Constitution. Such are the University of Michigan, the University of Minnesota, the University of Utah, and others. Such corporations have been characterized by the Supreme Court of Michigan as “the highest form of juristic person known to the law.” Such institutions are

not subject to control or change by the State Legislature. Their boards are coordinate with the Legislature.

A review of a few constitutional and statutory declarations will serve to indicate where the legal responsibility lies in State universities and colleges. The Michigan provision, after naming the departments, is as follows:

The immediate government of the several departments shall be entrusted to their respective faculties; but the regents shall have power to regulate the course of instruction and prescribe, under advice of the professorships, the books and authorities to be used in the several departments (Compiled Laws of Michigan, 1929, Section 7774).

The wording of the constitutional clause in Minnesota is exactly the same (Minnesota Constitution, Article 8, Section 10).

In Missouri the Board of Curators is the governing board of the State university. The powers of this board are defined by statute as follows:

The Curators shall have power to appoint and remove, at discretion, the president, dean, professors, instructors and other employees of the University; to define and assign their powers and duties and fix their compensation (Revised Statutes of Missouri, 1939, Section 10790).

In Nebraska the statute provides as follows:

The immediate government of each college shall be by its own faculty, which shall consist of the professors therein, but no course of study shall be adopted or series of textbooks used without the approval of the Board of Regents (Revised Statutes of Nebraska, 1943, Section 85-108).

In my own State of Indiana the statute provides that the Trustees of Indiana University shall be a body politic and have the power "To elect a president, such professors and other officers for such university as shall be necessary, and prescribe their duties and salaries; to prescribe the course of study and discipline and price of tuition in such university; and to make all by-laws necessary

to carry into effect the powers hereby conferred" (Burns Revised Statutes of Indiana, 1933, Section 28-5302).

The statute of Ohio concerning The Ohio State University is as follows:

The Board of Trustees shall elect, and fix the compensation of and remove the president and such number of professors, teachers and other employees as may be deemed necessary. The Board shall fix and regulate the course of instruction and prescribe the extent and character of experiments to be made at the University (Ohio General Code, Section 7949).

Fortunately that is not the law in Indiana, and our board did not have to prescribe the character or extent of Dr. Kinsey's experiments.

These are but a few examples, but they represent the nature of such enactments. If you wonder why the statutes I cite are all from states that begin with letters near the middle of the alphabet, I might say that I just happened to sit down in the library near the middle of the stacks containing the statutes of the several States and naturally looked at those handiest. Time did not permit reading all of them, although I did read all of them some years ago when examining them for another paper on another subject, and I am generally familiar with them.

## II

Now, having defined the position from which I view the academic profession and the legal conditions under which I must do the viewing, I will say that, as a member of a university governing board, I look upon our Faculty in much the same way that a director of any large business corporation views the corps of experts employed by that corporation to carry out the technical processes necessary to the production of the company, whether that production be steel, automobiles, refrigerators, or radios. Neither a director of a corporation nor a trustee of a university has the knowledge or skill to take the place of the experts and the specialists. Not many railroad directors could lay out and build a railroad or board a modern locomotive and pilot a train successfully from one terminal to another. Not many directors of a steel-

producing corporation could design a blast furnace, puddle a beat of steel, or actually roll a steel rail or beam or plate. Not many university trustees could successfully teach a class. We must depend on you teacher-specialists and experts in the various subject-matter fields for the output of universities—namely, education. Most of us still view you as we did our professors in our undergraduate days—with respect for your superior knowledge, your teaching skill, and your influence upon our lives and the lives of the students continually coming under your guidance. A university is just exactly as good or bad as its Faculty. We know that we cannot have a first-rate university with a low-grade Faculty, and that the excellence of our university depends upon the excellence of our professors.

Every one of us here tonight can look back on our student days and remember some one or more of our teachers, in grade or high school or in college—those God-made apostles of learning who inspired us to deeper study, who created in us a yearning to search further for greater truths, and who imparted to us the words of wisdom that have remained with us through the decades. When we think of these great men and women we are apt to want to raise our eyes toward heaven and send up a prayer of thanks for the privilege that has been ours to sit at the feet of really great teachers.

### III

Thus do we start in our viewing and thus do we continue until there come to us complaints and criticism of some Faculty person—complaints from students, from parents of students, from citizens, from John Taxpayer, from groups of citizens, or from a large segment of the body politic. These complaints may grow from mere murmurings to clamorous shoutings. For unfortunately not all members of the academic profession belong to the angelic group I have just mentioned.

What then is the duty of the institution's governing board? I am conversant with the provision of the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure that such situations "should, if possible, be considered by both a Faculty committee and the governing board of the institution" and with the pro-

cedural provisions that assure a teacher due process. With these provisions and with the other principles of academic freedom and tenure set forth in the 1940 Statement of Principles I personally am in accord, and the Board of Trustees of Indiana University of which I am a member has endorsed these principles. But I am inclined to think that the governing boards of some State institutions are not in complete agreement with all of the provisions of this Statement, particularly the provision concerning the bodies that should pass judgment in cases of charges brought against members of the Faculty. The statutes and the constitutions of most State universities, as we have noted, provide otherwise and the governing boards of these institutions cannot escape the responsibility which is legally theirs.

What in general should be the duties of a governing board? When I was very young I became a trustee of a public library, and having no information on running a library and no conception of a trustee's duties, I consulted a couple of trained and experienced librarians. One of them said a good trustee would be one who selected a good librarian and then went home. Perhaps a good university trustee would be one who elects a good president and then goes home. Some years later, in speaking at a meeting of the American Library Association, I told that story. Service of more than forty years on a library board and nearly a quarter of a century on a university board has constrained me to believe that, with a slight change of wording, the advice might be pretty good. If he had said a *perfect* librarian instead of a *good* one, I could go along. But perfect librarians, perfect college presidents, and perfect professors are still unavailable in quantity production; so we must move along with the best material available. Perfect trustees are also not available.

If a governing board contents itself with the selection of the best president available and with him develops and determines the broad general principles upon which the institution is to be conducted and then leaves the administration and the academic processes to the administrative officers and the Faculty, it will have done its work well.

But when trouble arises and disputes occur, the board of a public institution such as I have discussed must hold itself available to

sit as the court of last resort. For this reason, if for no other, members of governing boards of these institutions should seek to make themselves conversant with the nature, principles, and standards of the academic profession, the members of which carry on the work for which our colleges and universities were created and are supported. It is one of the purposes of the Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions to encourage members of the governing boards of these institutions to familiarize themselves with the academic profession with the members of which they work as associates in a joint enterprise for the common good.



## ANCIENT ANSWERS TO TODAY'S CURRICULUM PROBLEMS<sup>1</sup>

By WILLIAM CHARLES KORFMACHER

Saint Louis University

American higher education has for some years been displaying very healthful signs of dissatisfaction with itself, and of a belief that it is not meeting as fully as it might the startling challenge that our America of today and of tomorrow is setting before it. The recently published *Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education*<sup>2</sup> is a somewhat weighty tome, incorporating within a single set of two covers the Commission's six "volumes." It is to one segment of this publication that I should like to address the present remarks, with the thought that the problems and hopes there enunciated are not, of course, altogether new and strange; and with the added thought that the tradition represented by Eta Sigma Phi, as a national honorary classical fraternity, has something to offer in the issues at hand.

The first volume of the Commission's Report is entitled "Establishing the Goals." Within this volume, the third chapter, called "Education for Free Men," advances a discussion of the need, the objectives, the methods, and the operations of what is there called "general education." And "general education," within the chapter, (page 49) is defined as "the term that has come to be accepted for those phases of nonspecialized and nonvocational learning which should be the common experience of educated men and women." This may seem to us to be pretty close to our long standing concept of "liberal education." But the Commission finds a difference, as follows (page 49):

Thus conceived, general education is not sharply distinguished from liberal education; the two differ mainly in degree, not in kind.

<sup>1</sup> Presented at the Regional Conference of Eta Sigma Phi at the University of Mississippi, Oxford, Mississippi, March 12, 1949.

<sup>2</sup> *Higher Education for American Democracy*. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1948.



General education undertakes to redefine liberal education in terms of life's problems as men face them, to give it human orientation and social direction, to invest it with content that is directly relevant to the demands of contemporary society. General education is liberal education with its matter and method shifted from its original aristocratic intent to the service of democracy. General education seeks to extend to all men the benefits of an education that liberates.

Without pausing, except for a moment, to question the assumption of an "original aristocratic intent" in liberal education, let us hasten forward to further items of the chapter needful for our present discussion.

The *Report* bewails the alleged fact that "present college programs are not contributing adequately to the quality of students' adult lives either as workers or as citizens"—and this, "in large part because the unity of liberal education has been splintered by overspecialization" (page 47). It bewails likewise the alleged lack of "any core of unity in the essential diversity of higher education"; and it adds that "A society whose members lack a body of common experience and common knowledge is a society without a fundamental culture; it tends to disintegrate into a mere aggregation of individuals" (pages 48-49). Again, it insists that "Colleges must find the right relationship between specialized training on the one hand, aiming at a thousand different careers, and the transmission of a common cultural heritage toward a common citizenship on the other" (page 49).

## II

It is precisely in the term *common cultural heritage*, I believe, that the Commission has, wittingly or unwittingly, brought its recommendations very near to convictions and ideals which we in the classical languages have long treasured, and which we have consistently believed are applicable to the curriculum problems of today and tomorrow. It is a matter of simple historical fact that we of America possess a culture rooted in the soil of the distant past; and that this soil is Judaism, Christianity, and Graeco-Roman civilization. Without an understanding of our continuing indebtedness to these ancient institutions, any real appreciation of

American, and all other Western, culture is impossible. I propose in the few brief moments ahead to say a word about the Graeco-Roman ancestry of our present civilization in reference to the meaning and objectives of the "general education" appealed for in the *Report* of the President's Commission. Obviously, I do not in any sense pretend to assert that the classical tradition, or more specifically the study of the classical languages and civilization, will alone realize the objectives of such an education. But I do maintain that in these studies there is a core, a basis, a radiant center, an intelligent and consistent attention to which will aid, as few other studies can, towards reaching the high achievements the President's Commission is aspiring to attain.

*The first objective* envisioned by the Commission for the widespread "general education" it is proposing is phrased as follows: "To develop for the regulation of one's personal and civic life a code of behavior based on ethical principles consistent with democratic ideals" (page 50).

The *Report* dissents from the view often advocated that the purpose of higher education is primarily the training of the intellect, with little or no formal concern for the will or character. "If anything," says the *Report* (page 50), "is clear in these troubled times, it is the urgent need of soundly based ideals to guide personal and social relationships in a world where insecurity is steadily weakening trust between man and man."

There will, to be sure, be many views on how such ethical training and character development are to be imparted. No one would pretend that anything like a full answer is to be found in the classical literatures. And yet in these same writings there is a continuing and steady basis for ethical applications; and page after page of the masterpieces of Greek and Latin literature displays the anxious and sincere preoccupation of the ancients with problems of what to them concerned upright and honorable living.

Few readers, for example, can miss the moral earnestness of such a passage as that in which Socrates is represented as replying to his accusers (*Apology* 28, Jowett's version):

Some one will say: "Are you not ashamed, Socrates, of a course of life which is likely to bring you to an untimely end?" To him

I may fairly answer: "There you are mistaken: a man who is good for anything ought not to calculate the chance of living or dying; he ought only to consider whether in doing anything he is doing right or wrong—acting the part of a good man or a bad. . . . For wherever a man's place is, whether the place which he has chosen or that in which he has been placed by a commander, there he ought to remain in the hour of danger; he should not think of death or of anything but disgrace." And this, O men of Athens, is a true saying.

*The second objective* listed by the Commission reads as follows: "To participate actively as an informed and responsible citizen in solving the social, economic, and political problems of one's community, State, and Nation" (page 51). And in this connection the *Report* states vigorously: "Not only general observation but statistical studies of the attitudes and activities of college graduates have revealed the low level of their civic knowledge and their participation in social action" (page 51).

Surely it is true that the "better people," as we delight to call them, have often shunned public service; they have thought of politics as a sordid business; they have resisted, almost indignantly, any suggestion that they stand for local or state or even national office; they have evaded jury service, even though their doing so may have meant a progressively lower level in the mentality and training of the twelve good men and true who as peers framed the final verdict in our courts of law.

Against such an attitude the classical literatures are strongly, even fanatically, opposed. To Greeks and Romans as well, the state appeared as the great and ultimate reality to which all their strivings and efforts were to be directed. Cicero questioned seriously whether a man might devote himself to studies to the exclusion of participation in public life; speaking of such pursuits as the study of astronomy, mathematics, dialectics, and law, for example, he says (*De Officiis* I.19): "All these arts are occupied in the search after truth; but to be drawn by such an investigation away from the activities of life is opposed to moral duty." And in his *Dream of Scipio* (13) he represents the younger Scipio as being conveyed in a vision to the Milky Way, where he encounters his distinguished forebears in the enjoyment of the blessedness

they have earned. From them he learns, in the following words, that service to the state is man's highest privilege:

But, Africanus, that you may be readier unto the protecting of the commonwealth, understand this fact: for all who have preserved, aided, and increased their native land there is a fixed place appointed in heaven, that there they may in blessedness enjoy life eternal. For there is nothing done on earth more acceptable to that supreme Divinity who rules all the universe than the assemblies and gatherings of men allied by law, which we call states. The rulers and preservers of states come forth from this heavenly place and to it return.

*The third objective* set for "general education" is: "To recognize the interdependence of the different peoples of the world and one's personal responsibility for fostering international understanding and peace" (page 51).

Peace because all the world is interdependent, peace because the common people of all nations understand and appreciate one another, is surely an exalted objective, and surely one towards the attainment of which education—and education on the advanced levels—would have to play a large rôle. The viewpoints of students would have to be broadened, deepened, strengthened. And here, again, the classical tradition is at hand to help.

The ancient peoples, of course, had not the full idealism of international friendship and cooperation which we today advocate, even though so distinctive a concept as that of the "brotherhood of man" was advanced by thinkers like the philosophers of Stoicism. Alexander the Great entertained a mighty vision of a fusion of Western and Eastern cultures, with the best elements of each uniting to form a new and more abundantly fruitful civilization. He even encouraged his Greek and Macedonian officers to take Oriental wives as a first step in the new alliance. And though he died before any measure of his dream could be realized, it is true that his far-flung conquests carried the light of Greek learning to regions where it had never before shone, and brought about that wider diffusion and internationalizing of Greek culture which characterized the Hellenistic age.

But it was rather the Romans who, though they nurtured no phil-

anthropic notions for the betterment of conquered peoples for those peoples' own sakes, yet in their own Roman interest did frequently better them. For Rome transformed from theory into living fact the concept, the priceless concept, of Law—Law for Rome and Italy, Law for all the widespread Roman world. The more conscientious emperors, especially—men like the Spanish Trajan and Hadrian, like the philosophic Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius—labored zealously and wholeheartedly for universally fair administration of the Law throughout their wide dominions. It was in that spirit of universality that a Roman citizen might anywhere make his appeal to the head of the Roman state; thus it was that the Apostle Paul, standing trial in the Holy Land, cried out: "But if there be none of these things whereof they accuse me, no man may deliver me to them: I appeal to Caesar. Then Festus having conferred with the council, answered: Hast thou appealed to Caesar? To Caesar shalt thou go" (*Acts* 25.11-12).

In the Roman empire, of course, law was universal because Roman military might *made* it so. In the hope of today's new internationalism, law will some day be universal because the various nations, and the people in them, will voluntarily *agree* to have it so. Yet the fact of some sort of universal functioning of law in the distant past, over what was for all practical purposes the whole world, cannot be other than a powerful inspiration to some wider and more benevolently established law in the world of tomorrow.

*The fourth objective* listed for "general education" is: "To understand the common phenomena in one's physical environment, to apply habits of scientific thought to both personal and civic problems, and to appreciate the implications of scientific discoveries for human welfare" (page 52). And the *Report* finds fault with an alleged current system wherein the study of the natural sciences stresses specialization and the apparent desire to prepare future scientists, when, says the *Report*, "What is needed instead is the integration of the significant methods and findings of the natural sciences into a comprehensive synthesis that will bring to the general student understanding of the fundamental nature of the physical world in which he lives and of the skills by which this nature is discerned" (page 52).

Science, to be sure, is thought of proudly as a possession of our

modern day. And yet its beginnings are ancient and remote. Babylonian astronomers were scanning the skies centuries before the beginning of the Christian age, and in our own western hemisphere the Maya Indians of Central America had made signal advances in the same study early in our own era. The very notion of a general approach to scientific truth belongs to the Greeks and Romans, among whom it was still thought possible for a man to be a "polymath" or one learned in all or many disciplines. The *spirit*, too, of scientific inquiry, the restless urge to know more of the constitution of the world we live in, is as early as the sixth century among the Greek physicists of Asia Minor. And "beginnings"—in medicine, mathematics, engineering, and a host of other fields—trace themselves back likewise to the Greeks and Romans.

The *fifth objective* is listed as follows: "To understand the ideas of others and to express one's own effectively" (page 52). And here the *Report* makes the obvious emphasis upon the need of an ability to think, to read, to write, and to express one's self with clarity and effectiveness.

In this domain, if in no other, the tradition of the classical peoples is of preeminent service. The very science of Logic, the very realm of philosophical inquiry, take their initiation and their proud development among the Greeks and Romans. These peoples saw, as few other ancient races appear to have seen, the paramount value of *language* as the medium of the expression of thought; and the history of their literature is a long pageant of astoundingly successful literary expression and astoundingly acute theorizing about the means to such accomplishment. As great a figure as Aristotle has included an *Art of Rhetoric* in his contributions to human thought; as distinguished a Roman as Cicero is remembered as the moulder of a prose style which set for centuries an ideal in composition for all Western culture.

The *sixth objective* is stated in these words: "To attain a satisfactory emotional and social adjustment" (page 53). And here the *Report* seems to veer strongly to the long standing notion that liberal education looks to the development of the *whole* man—to his physical betterment, yes, but especially to the perfecting of his higher and quasi-higher faculties: his intellect, of course, but also his will, his emotions, and his imagination.



The best ideals of education among the Greeks and Romans, the most mature expression of their thinking in their permanent literary remains, both equally stress the prime need of emotional control and emotional balance. Precisely because they were by nature warm-blooded and inclined to excess, the Greeks enshrined in imperishable literary expression the ideal of *meden agan*, the Latin *ne quid nimis*—"do nothing to excess." The ideal of *moderation* is ubiquitous, and almost tiresomely repeated. Greek tragedy turns on the thought that *hubris* or "insolence" is particularly hateful to gods and men and brings a sure and terrible vengeance. In Aeschylus, the principle is applicable to sweeping historical events; and in his historical play, *The Persians*, he portrays the frightful effects of insolence, of an over-reaching one's self, in the stunning defeat to the proud venture begun by the Persian Xerxes.

*The seventh objective* finds expression in this way: "To maintain and improve his own health and to cooperate actively and intelligently in solving community health problems" (page 54). And the *Report* adds, sententiously, that "The mental vigor and spirit of a people are conditioned by its state of physical health" (page 54).

Here, again, we are likely to think of today as the age of health and hygiene—forgetting, incidentally, that the very word *hygiene* goes back to *Hygieia*, the Greek personification of "good health" and the attendant upon Asclepius, the god of healing. Ancient knowledge of things medical, though much was accomplished, was naturally almost as nothing by comparison with what is known today. And yet the *ideal* of health was there. Athenian education combined a training in strength and grace of body with a training in acuteness of mind and emotional balance. Bodily vigor and health were deemed the natural and proper concomitants to inner excellence and virtue. And the ideal of *mens sana in corpore sano*—"a sound mind in a sound body"—is the ideal proposed by the Roman satirist Juvenal, and the preeminent boon, he says, which we may ask of the immortal gods.

*The eighth objective* is "To understand and enjoy literature, art, music, and other cultural activities as expressions of personal and social experience, and to participate to some extent in some form

of creative activity" (page 54). And the *Report* adds significantly: "One of the tasks of American democracy is to heighten and diffuse esthetic sensibility and good taste, to make our people sensitive to beauty in all its varied forms: in the commodities and services of everyday life, in private and public buildings, in community and regional planning" (page 55).

Let us glance at the words—*literature, art, music, cultural activities*: no one of them is without Greek or Latin origin. The term *aesthetic* is Greek; and the love of beauty, the effective desire to express that love in artistic form, the will to make even the ordinary utensils of everyday life things of individual beauty and charm—these are among the most distinguishing characteristics of the Greek people. No later civilization has supplanted the Greek ideal of line and proportion, or architectural attractiveness, of loveliness of painting, statue, or written word.

*The ninth objective* is stated in these words: "To acquire the knowledge and attitudes basic to a satisfying family life" (page 56). And the *Report* says, in summarizing fashion: "General education will render a real service to our society as well as to individual students if it makes preparation for a stable, happy, all-sharing family life one of its primary concerns" (page 56).

No one would, clearly, seek to make the historic life of the classical peoples, or their literary monuments, a textbook on marriage and its problems. Yet there is much in this life and these monuments to help us. The basic and unshaken tradition of monogamy, for example, among both Greeks and Romans is admirable and striking. So also is the well accepted ideal of reverence for parents and the elderly; so also, at Rome, the remarkably important place of the wife and mother, as a true partner in the Italic family; for at Rome woman enjoyed, from very early times, a place of dignity and independence almost without parallel in any other ancient society.

*The tenth objective* is: "To choose a socially useful and personally satisfying vocation that will permit one to use to the full his particular interests and abilities" (page 56). Too, says the *Report*, "Through education society should come to recognize the equal dignity of all kinds of work, and so erase distinctions based on occupational caste" (page 57).

Now it is true that ancient society, as slaveholding, tended to regard many types of labor as degrading and illiberal. But, it is likewise true that the ideal of toil, of the carrying out of a vocation, a set of duties, was strongly entrenched. The Greek and Latin writers love to portray the various callings of mankind. They love to portray the glory of industry and unremitting work. A Cato is praised for his vigor in toil—likewise a Varro, an Elder Pliny, as august a personage as a Roman emperor (Vespasian, for example). Philosophy too taught the need of devotion to duty; and Stoicism advanced the thesis that the divine plan has a fixed task for each man, which he—like a soldier at his post—must in conscience accomplish.

*The eleventh and final objective* is this: "To acquire and use the skills and habits involved in critical and constructive thinking" (page 57). And here the *Report* interestingly adds:

Ability to think and to reason, within the limits set by one's mental capacity, should be the distinguishing mark of an educated person. The conception prevailed in our Western tradition that Latin and Greek, mathematics, and formal logic were the most effective instruments for developing the power to think. These disciplines can be made to contribute to that end, but so can many others. Development of the reasoning faculty, of the habit of critical appraisal, should be the constant and pervasive aim of all education, in every field and at every level (page 57).

Here surely the tradition of the classical civilizations and writings can be abundantly useful. The "habit of critical appraisal" is the very life of their highest expression—one of the soundest reasons early liberal studies in the classics have been the glory of free societies and the bane and curse of the dictator. Socrates, as Plato represents him, makes it a fundamental dogma that the unexamined life is not worth the living. And a reading of the Platonic dialogue will reveal the constant pattern of questioning, searching, inquiring—in ceaseless and ardent appraisal towards the attainment of truth.

### III

These, then, are the eleven "objectives of general education" as outlined in the first volume of the *Report of the President's Com-*

*mission on Higher Education.* We may well question them, find objectives to add to them, discover emphases to place in them. But probably we shall conclude that, to put it warily, they offer much that is profitable, much that is good.

I have no intention, clearly, of setting up a study of the Greek and Latin languages and of Greek and Roman civilization as a sole or even dominant means of realizing these objectives through college curricula. The very concept of "general education" envisions the concordant use of many subjects, of many disciplines, to attain the end of well rounded and balanced personality. Nor do I mean to imply that a course or two in one of the classical languages, as often taught, will automatically realize all the benefits that have been catalogued in these pages.

But I do maintain that in a sympathetic and intelligent study of these languages and the cultures and civilizations they represent some emphasis upon *all* the objectives advocated by the *Report* can be had; and that Latin and Greek—far from having no claim to a place in such a scheme of "general education"—may mightily look to such a central position among educational disciplines as they have in our own past traditionally enjoyed.

## COPYRIGHTS AND THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION<sup>1</sup>

By SAM BASS WARNER

Library of Congress

I was particularly pleased to be invited to speak at this meeting of the American Association of University Professors. I was for many years a university professor and am still a member of this Association.

What I plan to do today is to say a few words to you about the respects in which the copyright law affects you and then try to answer any questions that you may put to me. But first I think I should briefly explain the nature of copyright.

There was no copyright or other legal protection for authors in the ancient and medieval worlds. Authorship was an avocation, not a vocation. The first copyright act of major importance was the famous Statute of Anne of 1710. The impetus for copyright in the American colonies is said to have been given by Noah Webster, who wanted to make money out of his speller and drove from one colonial capital to another to get statutes passed to prevent unauthorized reprints of that book. When the Constitution was drafted a provision for the protection of authors, or rather for the stimulation of authorship, was put in it. Article I, Section 8, provides that Congress is empowered "to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries."

The corollary to this concept is that our Constitution and statutes endeavor to give no copyright protection to a work when that will not promote the progress of science and the useful arts. The statute requires that an author must do something affirmative in order

<sup>1</sup> Address presented on February 27, 1949 at the Thirty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors in Washington, D. C., at the Hotel Statler, February 26 and 27, 1949.

to obtain copyright, in many cases that is, to publish the work with a copyright notice on it and then send two copies of it together with an application and a \$4.00 registration fee to the Copyright Office. If the desire for the exclusive right to copy is not of sufficient interest to an author to cause him to go to this inconvenience and trifling expense, then the thought is that registering his copyright will not spur him on to the activities of authorship. Better leave his work in the public domain so other authors may use it freely!

Most people do not realize the importance to scholars of requiring an author to do an affirmative act to secure copyright rather than granting him copyright automatically as is done in western Europe. Speaking generally, everything published in western Europe is at the time of its publication and for many years thereafter under copyright, while in the United States huge blocks of research materials are free for scholars and others to use as they please. For example, less than one-half of one per cent of our newspapers are copyrighted and only twenty-five per cent of our magazines. The copyright law forbids the copyright of publications of the United States government and very few state, county, or municipal publications are in fact copyrighted. I need not tell you how valuable it is to you and other scholars to have all these materials free from all restrictions, rather than have them protected by copyright, which means that would-be copiers must secure the consent of the copyright owner or his successor in interest. Any of you who have tried to locate a group of authors or their successors in interest ten, twenty, or forty years after the publication of some work will testify to the difficulty, and often the impossibility, of the task.

Another respect, very important to scholars, in which our copyright law differs from that of western Europe is the ease with which it can be determined under our law whether the copyright has expired.

Our law grants copyright for a definite period of years, twenty-eight years with the right to renew for a like period. Just look at the date in the copyright notice and add fifty-six years and you have a sure method of determining whether copyright has run out.

In western Europe, on the other hand, the usual copyright term



is the life of the author plus fifty years thereafter. You must know when the author died to tell whether copyright has run out. Woe betide you if you want to quote a statistical table from a book by an obscure author! Though the book was published a century ago, it may still be under copyright protection in western Europe.

It is because the copyright law of western Europe disregards the interest of scholars and of the public in these and other important respects that the United States has never joined the western European copyright convention, the Berne Convention. Under it copyright is viewed as a property right of the author and his publishers. By and large the Berne Convention is drafted to protect only private interests. We, on the other hand, view copyright as a privilege granted by the law for a limited period in order to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, in short, as something in which the public interest plays the major rôle.

Perhaps at this point I should digress a moment to explain how copyright, that is, the exclusive right to copy a work, differs from an ordinary property right. If I design and manufacture a necktie, I own that necktie. The property in it belongs to me and I can do what I please with it, but I cannot keep other people who see it from copying it. Without my permission and without paying me a royalty, the whole world can, if it wishes, copy my necktie. The same thing is true of all the other property I own which is neither patented nor copyrighted.

When I copyright a book I have the same absolute and perpetual property right in the book itself, viewed as a physical object, that I have in the necktie. In addition, I have for a limited period of years another right which I do not have in my necktie, the exclusive right to make copies of my book, that is, copyright. It is this right to exclude others from making copies which our Constitution prescribes shall be exercised in the public interest, that is, to promote the progress of science and the useful arts.

Since my work as Register of Copyrights is the Lorelei which enticed me away from teaching and a university professorship, I think I should say a few words about it. My first duty is to supervise the operations of the Copyright Office, a branch of the Library of Congress, with a staff of over 200 people and over seven million records of copyrights. Besides receiving, registering, and catalogu-

ing many thousands of copyright claims each year, over 238,000 in 1948, the office answers each year many thousands of questions about copyright registrations and about United States and foreign copyright laws. Another of my official duties, and one that greatly fascinates me, is finding out how the copyright law operates here and abroad, so that I may evaluate its operations and be prepared to offer suggestions to Congress and to the Department of State on how it may be changed to better meet the needs of authors, scholars, radio chains, motion picture companies, and other copyright users. As international copyright relations are in a state of flux, and changes in book production, phonograph records, radios, including television, and motion picture practices are continually occurring, I find this is an endless occupation. In 1948 it required me to go both to Europe and to South America as well as to make many trips within the United States.

## II

But it is high time that I turned to how copyright affects you. Practically every one of you often has occasion both to use the copyrighted writings of others and to write original works yourselves. You come into contact with the copyright law when you do either. First, let us assume that each of you has just completed a work and is contemplating its publication. From the point of view of copyright, the first question you have to decide is whether you care if your work is copied. If you have no objection to other people copying your work and perhaps claiming that they wrote it themselves, then there is no reason why you should copyright it.

Let me illustrate your problem with some experiences of my own. I once wrote a casebook on Civil Procedure in Oregon. The maximum possible market for the book was sixty copies a year. I was teaching one of the two classes that might use the book. There was, therefore, no chance of competition. Copyright was unnecessary. I have also written two books on criminal law and numerous law review articles that were copyrighted by the publishers. The publishers never discussed with me whether they should obtain copyright, so I do not know why they did so. If they expected to receive royalties from other publishers who would put

out other editions of my works either in English or in other languages, I admire their optimism.

My articles have occasionally been reprinted in other reviews and a few times translated into foreign languages or quoted from in books, but never to my knowledge has the copyright law helped me. Instead of trying to prevent other people from reprinting what I have written, I have always been delighted when they did so.

Three times to my knowledge, my language has been used without acknowledging my authorship. Each time my first reaction was that of anger, but my later feeling was one of regret that my work had not been copied more extensively. If it had been, think how I should have enjoyed writing an article ostensibly deploring the carelessness of modern scholars, but actually demonstrating, as subtly as I was able, what a great scholar I was, since my ideas and modes of expression had so permeated the scholarly world that writers took them to be their own. Alas, I never got the opportunity!

Most of you, however, are better writers than I and write on fields that have a wider commercial appeal. When you write a casebook or textbook it is important to copyright it, so that you, rather than some literary pirate, shall reap the monetary reward. If you do not copyright your work, anybody is free to publish it over your name in English or any other language without even asking your permission, to say nothing of paying you a royalty on each copy sold. Within wide limits, anybody can also use your writings, if you do not copyright them, without acknowledging your authorship.

When you copyright a work, you need a magic phrase just as much as did Ali Baba in "The Forty Thieves." Your open sesame is the word "copyright" followed by the year and the name of the copyright owner, as for example "Copyright, 1949, John Doe." In order to obtain and keep copyright, those words must be placed on the title page or its back of every copy of your book. When you have published your book with this notice on the title sheet, you must then send two copies, \$4.00, and an application for copyright registration to the Copyright Office. I have said that you must do these things. Actually, your publisher will attend to

them and you will secure copyright without the slightest inconvenience.

Very few publishers make any mistakes in securing copyrights. They have done it so many times that they are thoroughly familiar with the process. If trouble occurs, it is nearly always due to the actions of the author before he publishes his book. When you write a book, you are likely to try it out on your classes for a number of years. Not being a millionaire, you will sell copies of your stenciled product to your students. Knowing nothing about copyright, you will fail to put the copyright notice on the title page of your stencil. Presto, you will have lost your copyright! By selling your work without the magic copyright notice, you will have dedicated it to the public beyond recall. Or, perhaps, you may publish chapters of your forthcoming book in magazines or newspapers that are not copyrighted, and thus lose your right to secure copyright protection.

Now let us shift our viewpoint and consider your situation when you want to use the materials of others either in one of your classes or in a book which you are writing. Perhaps, for example, you would like to mimeograph a chapter out of an expensive textbook so that members of your class can read it without going to the expense of buying the book. In determining whether you may lawfully do this, the first step is to look at the title page of the book and its verso to see if there is a copyright notice in the book. If the book has no copyright notice and was published in the United States, you are safe in assuming that it is not under copyright and that you may lawfully copy from it. There is the theoretical possibility that there may be an authorized edition with a copyright notice in it and that you are looking at a pirated edition, but this possibility is so unlikely that you are justified in ignoring it.

If the book contains no copyright notice and was published outside of the United States, you are almost, though not quite, as safe in assuming that it is not under copyright protection as if it were published in the United States. It is barely possible that you may be looking at a foreign edition of a book which is also published in the United States with a proper copyright notice. I always used to assume that such a book was not under copyright, though knowing what I now do about copyright I think I should

have asked at the university library or bookstore whether there was an American edition.

If the book contains a copyright notice, look at the date of the notice. If the date is more than 56 years ago, the book used to be under copyright, but is so no more. If the date is less than 56 years ago, investigate to see if there are earlier editions which are more than 56 years old. If there are, do your copying from an earlier edition.

If the date is between 28 and 56 years ago, the chances are 9 out of 10 that the book is not under copyright protection. The copyright law provides a twenty-eight year term of copyright protection, that is, 28 years from the date of first publication. At the end of 28 years the book is in the public domain and may be copied by anybody, provided that the copyright was not renewed. The method of renewing a copyright is for the author or his successors to file an application for copyright renewal in the Copyright Office. We keep a record of renewals and publish a list of them in our catalogues. Therefore, the way to find out whether the copyright on a book has been renewed is either to write the Copyright Office or to look in our catalogues for the appropriate period.

If the book is under copyright protection, you should write to the copyright proprietor, that is, the person whose name is given in the copyright notice, for permission to reprint material in the book. If you do not know his address, write to him care of the publisher of the book. You should do this regardless of whether you wish to mimeograph a few pages for class use or to quote the author in your next work. Even if the book is not under copyright, I believe that Emily Post would advise you to write, on the ground that "professional courtesy" requires such action. If the author gives you permission you are probably safe, but to be absolutely safe you should write to the Copyright Office and find out if he is still the owner of the copyright.

Since I have been Register of Copyrights, a number of cases have come to my attention in which professors have tried to locate the copyright owner and have been unable to do so. The author was dead, the publisher had gone out of business, and letters were returned undelivered. In such a case you have to calculate the

risk you are taking and then balance it against the value to you of the material you wish to copy. In most cases I think your answer will be that you can find other and better material to copy.

As Register of Copyrights, I have received many inquiries about the doctrine of "fair use." Historically, it grew out of the attempts of authors to bring pressure on persons who reviewed their works unfavorably. This doctrine permits a reviewer to quote from a book in order to bring out his points. Though there is very little judicial authority on other aspects of the doctrine of fair use, it undoubtedly has other applications. For example, I cannot conceive of any court holding that members of a class in mathematics were unlawfully copying, if they wrote out the problems in a book. Similarly, the exercises in a language text are placed there for the purpose of being copied by students. I feel confident also that it is not violating copyrights for an instructor to quote, in his examinations, passages from books he is using. But when the instructor has material mimeographed for his class instead of buying copies of the book, then I think the instructor is violating the author's copyright, because he is engaging in a copying which cuts down the sale of the book.

I shall now try to answer any questions you may ask me. But please remember that I have been studying copyright for only four years and you all know that a professor does not really learn much about his subject in that short period.



## "THE TROUBLE WITH FRESHMAN COMPOSITION—"

By JOHN B. VIRTUE

Michigan State Normal College

The other evening I had a conversation that was the counterpart of at least a score in which I have taken part over the years since I began to teach English. My vis-à-vis happened this time to be a professor of law. On other occasions he has been a professor of chemistry, or physics, or psychology, or history, or economics, or sociology, or political science, or electrical engineering. Whatever his field, he has invariably taught me the Sisyphean nature of the task a teacher of English undertakes when he essays to make an outsider grasp the true inwardness of that ancient academic bugbear, the Problem of Composition.

I know the conversation by heart. We are chatting in my living room. I remark that I have just finished grading a set of freshman themes. Perhaps my voice has a plaintive note, such as one is tempted to adopt after marking the fourteenth dangling participle. Anyhow, my friend is sympathetic. Of course, he doesn't handle the freshman work in his department any more, and though my words may be strong, they make a tale of little meaning to him. But he sympathizes. He has his own troubles of the same sort, it appears. He has just been reading a set of upper-class or professional-school exams, and—

(My friend pauses and an expression that I name to myself "The Look" comes over his face. It is really a series of expressions mirroring an interior monologue that runs something like this: "Shall I say it? Would it hurt his feelings? Would I be presuming on our long friendship? Would I be taking advantage of my position as a professor of one of the *fundamental* studies? Well, but why not? After all, these fellows in English are always making *me* feel a little uncomfortable, with their air of always being secretly amused at my slips in grammar. Maybe I have this little pleasure

coming to me. After all, facts are facts, and there's no getting around them. Things have come to a pretty pass! It's a pity, too. The poor drudges work hard. And some of them are bright, pleasant fellows, though somewhat on the featherweight side. But they should be told the truth once in a while.")

And would I believe it—my friend goes on, unaware that he has told me more than he has said—would I believe it—half the stuff he has had to read was either so marred by errors in grammar and diction that it would damn a high-school boy, or else so vague, incoherent, and incomplete in thought as to make the reading like working a crossword puzzle of which a pixilated typesetter has pied the clues.

## II

This speech ends Phase One of the conversation. It may be delivered robustiously, plaintively, mordantly, or weightily, according as my friend's temperament happens to be sanguine, melancholy, choleric, or phlegmatic. But whatever the manner, I know what is coming. While I am clearing my throat and saying, "Well—uh—," he will remark that "it makes one wonder how these students ever graduated from your freshman composition courses, for they don't seem to have learned much there."

At this I manage to utter a deprecatory sound. My friend merely raises his voice a few decibels and bumbles on. He is in the groove now. Why is it, he continues, that freshman composition is the worst-taught of all college subjects? The teacher of chemistry or history in a year's time presents to his students a body of facts, a body of concepts, a body of principles. When the year is up, the students know the subject at least fairly well or they are certified as incompetent in it. They take from the course a body of organized knowledge. The same students come out of a course in composition certified as competent writers, and what do they bring with them? What do they know? What can they do? He'll tell me: half of them don't know when to use a subjunctive, and in fact don't know what a subjunctive is. They are as likely to split an infinitive as they are to end a sentence with a preposition. And that's pretty likely. Furthermore—

At this point I manage to stop him. Wait a minute, I say. Such points of propriety as these he has just mentioned are of minor importance. Nobody in my work pays much attention to them nowadays. (He stares. He is thinking, "Shades of Miss Elwell, who taught me grammar in the ninth grade! These fellows don't even know their own subject!") We don't think the worse of a man today, I continue, for writing "If this is treason—" instead of "If this be treason—" Our students are not advised to absolutely avoid split infinitives: they are taught to put modifiers where they will do their work most effectively and least obtrusively. We do not forbid students to end sentences with prepositions: we try to get them to see that ordinarily a sentence is stronger if it ends with an important word than it is if it doesn't. But, we add, an occasional sentence-ending-with-a-preposition is nothing to worry about.

### III

I see that my friend is getting a bit impatient with my fooling. Look here, I tell him, I interrupted him because what he was saying seemed to imply a belief that somewhere in Nature there exists a body of 100 or 1000 or 5000 prohibitory rules, the learning of which will make a man a good writer. And further, I say, I gather that he thinks the main business of teachers of composition is to teach these rules.

He admits that this is about what he thinks. I see that his hackles are up, and I try to mollify him. See here, I say, I've read some of his articles. How much does the admirable clarity and literary polish of his style depend upon his present awareness of the grammatical categories or the handbook *don't's*? Not much, I answer for him. He could probably not parse a simple sentence today, and conceivably might not even be able to pick one from a page of print. No, the reason why his verbs agree with their subjects, and his pronouns with their antecedents—the reason why his participles don't hang in mid-air—the reason why he always says "they did it" rather than "they done it" is simply that he has through long practice and observation formed a multitude of habits the effect of which is to bring his speech and his writing into conformity with the speech and writing of other men who

value clarity and nicety of expression. I do not deny that the grammar he once learned played some part in building these habits. It doubtless made him more observant, more anxious than he would have been without it to conform to the usage of educated men. But the main factors in his development of what may loosely be called "correct" habits of expression have been imitation and practice.

But, I continue, this was not all, or nearly all. More important than even habits are attitudes, or motives, or drives. He has made himself into a skilled writer largely because he had the will to communicate what he knew or thought. Respecting his subject, his audience, his language, himself, he had made a practice (again that word *practice*) of planning carefully his strategy of presentation, of bringing into his discourse everything needed to complete the picture he is trying to draw, and eliminating everything extraneous; of filing his sentences to give them the utmost clarity, precision, and force, and to make each dovetail neatly with its neighbors.

Most important of all, however, is the fact that he has studied his subject—has thought about it. His skilled writing about it today is the distillate of his earlier study: it is the expression of his laboriously achieved thought. And how has he achieved his present thought? By reading, by listening, by speaking, by writing—in short, by *practice* of the communication skills.

Now, I say, consider what this last fact signifies. It signifies that the communication skills, even speaking and writing, are both the means by which learning is carried on, and the results of learning.

I pause. My friend has just covertly looked at his watch. He has been tapping his foot on the floor. Now he catches at a stray thought, not irrelevant to our subject. Have I heard, he asks, what one of Smith's students wrote in a sociology quiz the other day? Well, he wrote, "It may be taken for *granite* that a *hole* is greater than *some* of its parts."

He laughs sardonically as he says this. Doesn't he see, I ask him, that the blundering sentence he has quoted is evidence of the validity of what I have been saying? He smiles, shakes his head, and repeats, "taken for granite. . . taken for granite." I decide to take another approach.

Everybody in my branch of the profession, I tell him, is concerned about the apparent ineffectiveness of the freshman course in composition. We are constantly trying to find out wherein we fail and why, and what to do about it. Look at our professional journals. They are full of articles hammered out by conscientious teachers between exhausting bouts of theme-reading, attempting to define the proper aims of the course, to find objective criteria for measuring the results of our labors, to decide what are the best classroom procedures, to discover how much, if any, prescriptive grammar students should learn, to determine what kinds and amounts of reading and writing students should be required to do if they are to become proficient—in short, trying to improve the course. We are not unaware of the powerful odor that seems to emanate from our corner of the campus.

Here my friend smiles. So we know about that smell, do we? And we are trying to animate the corpse? There are some people, he suggests, who would like to see the old boy buried. In short, it's about time for the English department to do its job with respect to composition, or—

We don't admit a thing, I tell him. I said that the odor *seems* to come from our neighborhood. But, I say, let's leave that on one side for a moment. I want to continue what I was saying about the people who teach composition. Of course, much of this work during recent years has been done by relatively unskilled labor. During the war we had to press into service a lot of people who in ordinary times would have been doing other things. The crisis in recruitment of teachers for these courses is rather cruelly caricatured in a story going the rounds of the profession in several versions. In one version a Frenchman encounters an American friend in a hotel lobby in New York. "How are you making out over here now, Jacques?" asks the friend. "*A merveille*, my old one," says Jacques. "Alors, now, I spik ze language verree well: I am eble to enter ze *restaurant*, wherevair, and ordair ze *dîner* in *anglais*." A bystander who has heard the conversation steps up and says, "Pardon me, but I'm head of the English department of Metro University, and I wonder whether I could persuade you to teach a couple of sections of freshman composition."

## IV

Though things have never really been as bad as that, I say, even in the best of times the problem of staffing the freshman composition courses has been a hard one. From where I sit, it looks to have been the worst-bungled assignment on the campus—bungled at the level of higher administration, I add. For the funds are not provided to make it possible to put every section of freshman composition in the charge of a mature, seasoned teacher whose interest in the work he is doing is that of a professional who happily looks forward to doing some of it for years to come. In most large universities, accordingly, this work is delegated to young candidates for doctoral degrees in English who are glad to do it with their left hands, so to speak, at the rate of six or seven hundred dollars per year for each section of twenty-five students. But with them, the job is a mere stopgap. They look forward to the day when they will be done with this tedious apprentice work, and will, as professors of literature, never again have to look a set of themes in the face. For the big money—as big money goes in the academic world—is for professors of literature. The plain fact is that though the work of the freshman composition course is important, no one can find the money to pay for getting it done as well as it could be done.

My friend has been drumming on the chair arm during the latter portion of this speech. Now he says rather impatiently that he thinks I am clouding the issue. I reply that I haven't even come to the issue. I've merely been giving him some of the background of the problem he thinks we're so bad at solving. And, I add, it goes a long way back. For English is even in the secondary schools the orphan of the curriculum. There the English teacher is commonly "told off" to coach plays, train debaters, and supervise the school paper. Any teacher of another subject who doesn't have a full schedule may be drafted to teach an English class. Even the football coach, if he isn't careful, may find himself struggling with the participles and gerunds. This state of affairs makes trouble for teachers on the college level, as surely my friend will see.

The drumming on the chair arm has recommenced, so I drop the subject, on which more might be said. Will my friend, I ask, con-



sider with me the task that confronts the teacher of composition in a class of twenty-five average college freshmen? They are, of course, lovable youngsters—healthy, full of undisciplined energy, attractive as puppies. They are also children of a depression and a war: they have never known quiet and security. They have been nourished mainly on raw sensation, either dished out by experience, or transmitted through those subtle media of expression, the radio and the motion picture. Their schooling has been of the lick-and-a-promise type. The majority of them have never on their own initiative read a book. The printed page is a mystery to them—a whole constellation of mysteries, of which the first is, why it should exist anyhow. My friend admonishes me that I am exaggerating, and I admit that it is so. But, I ask, isn't the pattern true? Yes, he grants, it is. Well, then, I continue, consider the mind our teacher has to shape and fine down into an instrument for the production of lucid, well-ordered discourse. In contemplating it I am often reminded of Eddington's graphic description of interstellar space: vast regions of emptiness, sparsely dotted with specks of solid stuff (facts) sending out little pulsations of light, intermittently agitated by comets (ideas) wildly whooshing through the ineffable inane. Or I am reminded of a bowl of soup in a concentration camp, with—Here my friend interrupts again to say, yes, yes, he gets it, but why exaggerate so? To make him listen, I reply.

Now, I resume, let's go back to what we were saying a while ago about his own admirable prose style. He was once a freshman with such a "mind" as that which I have just pictured in my somewhat lurid fashion. Well, he admits, yes; though he had read lots of books before he came to college. But he was pretty ignorant, after all, and his ideas were pretty fuzzy. All right, I say, how did he become the excellent writer he is today? Wasn't it by doing lots of things at once and doing them continually, and doing them often without a thought about his prose style as such? For instance, he grew up, he matured, he gained experience of life, he observed, he learned from books, he felt the need of defining the qualities, the meanings, the interrelations of the data that his experience and his studies brought him. He read, he talked, he listened: thus, without consciously striving to do so, he sharpened his language sense,

his feeling for the ways in which thought takes on shape and substance in words and sentences and so becomes palpable to others. He wrote letters, reports, term papers, dissertations, articles, lectures. Because he wanted to communicate something on each occasion of writing, each occasion contributed to the increase of his power to communicate. His need to make his thoughts palpable drove him to make his writing clear; his effort to make his writing clear drove him to make his thoughts exact.

At this point my friend breaks in with a malicious twinkle. Am I not, he asks, talking myself out of a job? If, as I seem to be saying, composition is not an independent subject of study like any other in the curriculum, what does the English department mean by offering courses in it? If people learn to write by merely breathing—by getting experience, by reading, by talking, by attending lectures—by immersion, as it were, in things-in-general—why not abolish the freshman composition requirement? Why maintain an expensive institution when the purpose it is supposed to serve (but doesn't) can be served by a kind of self-baptism? Do I mean to sit there and tell him—

His voice has risen a little, and I have to brace myself to deliver the final thrust. Wait, I tell him. He has seen the point at last, only he has not quite seen around it. It is true that in an ideal state of affairs there would be no teachers of composition-as-such. For teachers of the genuinely independent studies would be training their students to write well about those subjects. They would assign frequent papers and would see to it that they were well done. For learning any subject is learning to define, to compare, to differentiate, to generalize, to abstract within the given field. Isn't this only to say that learning the subject is learning to write about it—or that learning to write about it is learning the subject? In either case, the great need is for practice. I mean doing, frequently, substantial pieces of writing, not merely covering a page once in a while with more or less plausible arrangements of words, expressing half-thought ideas, half-realized facts. If students are to have the constant practice in writing that they need in order to become skillful writers, most of their writing assignments will have to be made by teachers of other subjects than English, and the papers they write will have to be read by those same teachers, who alone

know the subject sufficiently well to give the requisite criticisms.

My friend is now squirming. In a moment he will be sputtering, so I hurry on. He mustn't think, I admonish him, that he is the first to contemplate the possible abolition of the freshman composition course. Esteemed members of my profession have advocated it. And in fact several institutions have done the deed. However, these institutions have found it necessary to take teachers of composition out of the English department and attach them by ones and twos to the other departments as a sort of doctors-in-residence, to give consultations to ailing writers on a clinical basis. They seem to have felt a need for some sort of specialized guidance for young writers. Of course, anyone in the English department could have told them that the standard freshman composition course is designed to give such guidance, and that it can do no more than give students a start in the formation of those habits and attitudes that, as I have already explained, are the essential elements of skill in writing—or in reading or in speaking or in listening. But at any rate, these institutions have recognized the true place of the communication skills in education: at the center, at the circumference, and at all points between. For these skills are, as I have said before, both the means and the results of learning. Thus, I conclude, every teacher is perforce a teacher of reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

By this time my friend's sputtering mechanism is working. Do I mean to sit there, he exclaims, and suggest that it is his duty—*his* duty—to turn himself into a mere paper-marking, sentence-revising, comma-splice-correcting, dangling-participle deplorer? Well, I admit, leave out the *mere*, and that's about what I mean. This bald effrontery stuns him, and I seize the moment to get in my last word. (He will be taking his leave soon.) Isn't this about the situation we have been looking at: Everybody—*everybody*—believes firmly that college-trained persons should be competent writers. Since no one wants to give students the kind of training that will make them competent writers, the department of English (consisting of philologists, literary historians, critics, and aestheticians) is assigned the task of doing what can be done for students in the mass. What the mass are like, we have sufficiently described. They are to be given the treatment, supposed to last for life, in

about a hundred hours of class time during what is normally their most chaotic and footless year of existence. It is supposed to equip them with a technique for expressing their ideas. To do that, it must provide them first with some facts and ideas. To do that, it must get them to read and consider. To do that, it must lead them to study the ways in which words can be made to do the varied work of the mind. To do that, it must teach them some grammar, some semantics, some etymology, some history of the language. To do that, it must make them see the bearing of all this on their intellectual development. And all of this is to be done in 100 hours by overworked drudges whom the rest of the faculty regard as not quite smart enough to evade the responsibility. And then, the effort having been made, the nascent abilities are allowed to decay from disuse: the student may be required to write no more than one or two essay-type examinations, and a term paper or two perhaps during his senior year. For the most part, however, he puts in his time listening to lectures, watching motion pictures, going on field trips. At last he reports the results of all these passive activities by scratching plus and minus signs on a mimeographed objective test. This bit of scribbling may convey some information to his teacher, but it assuredly contributes nothing to the student's intellectual training. I hope that my friend, I conclude, will realize now that the boy who took "for granite" the improbable proposition about "the hole" was providing evidence, not of the deficiencies of his teachers of English alone, but of the shortcomings of his entire schooling from kindergarten through college.

By this time my friend is on his feet. He has a lecture to prepare. Why not, I suggest, maliciously, have his class prepare and hand in to him a *précis* of his lecture. Why? he wants to know. To improve their skill in writing by giving them some practice, I respond. He can't take time for that, he says. And besides, that's my job. Why? I ask him. He will tell me some other time, he says, backing out the door. But he never does.

## ECONOMIC DEPENDENTS OF WOMEN FACULTY

By MARGUERITE J. FISHER<sup>1</sup>

Syracuse University

For some years the national organizations of professional and business women have been concerned with the responsibility of their members for the support of dependents. Frequently, as these women competed with men for positions of higher rank and salary, the employers have justified a lower rate of pay for women by such arguments as: "Women work only for pin money," or—"Women only have to support themselves—men must support a family."

To secure definite information with which to answer these contentions, several of the national women's organizations have made studies of the economic burdens carried by their members. One such study, made by the American Association of University Women in 1935 of over 10,000 of its employed members, revealed that 41% were supporting dependents, either fully or partially.<sup>2</sup> Three studies were conducted in 1927, 1931, and 1937 by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women. In the 1937 study it was found that, of 10,000 women who returned questionnaires, nearly half (48%) supported dependents on their earnings, and one in every six carried the entire responsibility for the support of a household of from two to eight persons.<sup>3</sup> The Federation study concluded:

It is not defensible to pay women less than men solely on the ground that men have to take care of a family and women do not. Half of our members are also earning a living for parents, sisters, brothers, husbands, and children, who in increasing numbers through the years turn to them as breadwinners and often as homemakers as well.

<sup>1</sup> With research assistance by Elizabeth Brookins.

<sup>2</sup> Women's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, *Bulletin No. 170*, "Economic Status of University Women" (1939), p. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Public Affairs Committee, *Why Women Work* (1941), p. 3.

To obtain a picture of the extent to which women faculty members, of the rank of assistant professor or above, support dependents and to compare the results with these earlier studies, questionnaires were sent in May, 1949, to 260 women faculty members in twenty colleges and universities in the Northeastern part of the United States. The following institutions were covered: Adelphi College, Alfred University, Allegheny College, Bates College, Bucknell University, Colby College, Columbia University (Teachers College), Columbia University, Cornell University, Houghton College, The Ohio State University, Rhode Island State College, St. Lawrence University, Syracuse University, University of Buffalo, University of Delaware, University of Illinois, University of Maryland, University of Massachusetts, and The University of Pennsylvania.

Replies were received from 158 women. These returns showed that over half (53.8%) supported dependents. Of those with dependents, nearly half (43.9%) were responsible for the entire support of such persons. Twelve per cent reported that they supported both total and partial dependents. A greater percentage of the women college teachers in 1949 support dependents (53.8%) than did the members of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women in 1937 (48%), or the members of the American Association of University Women in 1935 (41%).

Nearly a third of the women faculty members who are responsible for the support of others reported that they had two or more de-

TABLE I—DEGREE OF PARTIAL SUPPORT OF DEPENDENTS

% of Support	Number	%
10-20	19	33.3
20-30	6	10.5
30-50	8	14.1
50-75	13	22.8
75-90	11	19.3
TOTAL	57	100.0

pendents, entire or partial. Table I shows the extent of their partial support of these dependents. One-third of those con-



tributing partially provided from 10-20% of the dependents' support, but 42.1% provided from 50-100%, showing that nearly half of the women in this category made sizable contributions to the support of their dependents.

What kind of dependents are supported by these women? In contrast with the wife and children maintained by the male wage-earner, the women in about half of the cases (49.4%) are supporting either their mother or father, and occasionally both parents. As Table 2 reveals, sons and daughters and sisters and brothers rank next in order as dependents. With respect to the nature of dependents, this study of women faculty members shows much the same picture as the earlier studies by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women and the American Association of University Women. In all the investigations, the mother was found to be the dependent most often supported.

Of significance to the economic rôle of women is the increasing life span of both sexes in this country. Since parents are the dependents most often supported by gainfully employed women, with the lengthened expectation of life the maintenance of aged fathers and mothers is likely to fall even more heavily upon the

TABLE 2—NATURE OF DEPENDENTS

Nature	Number	%
Mother.....	29	37.7
Father.....	9	11.7
Aunt.....	2	2.6
Husband.....	3	3.9
Sister or brother.....	11	14.3
Sons and daughters.....	20	25.9
Nieces.....	3	3.9
TOTAL ANSWERS.....	77	100.0

shoulders of daughters. As studies by the United States Women's Bureau have revealed, employed daughters contribute to parental support considerably more often than do sons, the latter justifying their action on the ground that they have young families of their own to maintain.

Interestingly enough, a higher percentage of the married women faculty members support dependents (69.2%) than is the case with the single women (46.8%). As Table 3 reveals, the divorced, separated, and widowed women faculty members support dependents to the highest percentage (75%). The percentage of those who provide both partial and entire support rises with rank, with nearly a tenth of those in the rank of full professor responsible for both kinds of support.

TABLE 3—MARITAL STATUS AND DEPENDENTS

	Single		Married		Divorced		Separated		Widowed	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No dependents	59	53.2	8	30.8	2	33.3			2	25
Dependents	52	46.8	18	69.2	4	66.7	2	100	6	75
TOTAL	111	100.0	26	100.0	6	100.0	2	100	8	100

The question may be raised: of these women who support dependents, how many have an additional income to supplement

TABLE 4—AGE AND DEPENDENTS

	Under 30		30-35		35-40		40-45		45-50	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No dependents	2	66.7	5	55.6	3	27.3	11	36.7	10	40
Dependents	1	33.3	4	44.4	8	72.7	19	63.3	15	60
TOTAL	3	100.0	9	100.0	11	100.0	30	100.0	25	100

  

	50-55		55-60		60-65		65 up	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No dependents	16	55.2	10	37	10	76.9	6	85.7
Dependents	13	44.8	17	63	3	23.1	1	14.3
TOTAL	29	100.0	27	100	13	100.0	7	100.0

their faculty salaries? Only six per cent reported a separate income. This means that most women faculty members with dependents have to rely entirely upon their academic salaries.

From 35 to 50 years are the ages where the support of dependents tends to concentrate, with another upswing from 55 to 60 years (Table 4).

With more than one woman faculty member out of two supporting dependents, and in nearly half of these cases the burden being one of total rather than partial support, it is difficult for college and university administrators to justify a lower salary rate for women than for men. Such a policy is no longer in conformity with the changing economic rôle of American women. For many years the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor has been publishing the results of its research, showing the growing burden of economic responsibilities carried by women in industry, trade, and similar occupations. The same trend is revealed by this study of women faculty members, and by recent investigations of women in other professional or semiprofessional fields. Thus, the conclusions of such research furnish additional arguments for the principle of "equal pay for equal work."

# THE RÔLE AND WORK OF THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION<sup>1</sup>

By WALDO GIFFORD LELAND

United States National Commission for UNESCO

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, better known and more easily referred to as UNESCO, which has become its international name, was organized in London in November, 1945. The first session of its General Conference met in Paris in November, 1946; the second session in Mexico City in November, 1947; and the third in Beirut, Lebanon in November-December, 1948. Only three years and three months have passed since its constitution was signed in London on behalf of the governments of 42 countries, all member states of the United Nations Organization. During this brief period it has become clear that UNESCO represents the greatest effort yet attempted by the governments and peoples of the world to achieve mutual knowledge and understanding among themselves and to bring about that intellectual and moral solidarity upon which international peace and security and the common welfare of mankind must be founded. This effort is not to be taken lightly; nor is it taken lightly by the government and people of the United States, who devote time and energy and substantial funds to assuring its success, and who realize that they have a heavy stake in the enterprise.

## II

UNESCO is not a new and unprecedented undertaking, although some unhistorically-minded persons have naïvely claimed for it those doubtful merits. It is rather a culmination of earlier efforts

<sup>1</sup> Address delivered on February 26, 1949, at the Thirty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors, held in Washington, D. C., at the Hotel Statler, February 26 and 27, 1949.

and movements in recognition of the vital importance of intellectual and spiritual factors in international relations.

The second half of the nineteenth century witnessed the rapid growth of organizations and arrangements to promote cooperation among the intellectuals of the world. Congresses of specialists began to be organized, among the earliest of which was the International Congress of Chemistry; a little later the orientalists, the Americanists, the psychologists, the statisticians, and the historians, to mention only a few fields of study, began the holding of periodical international meetings. In 1900 a more general organization was formed—the International Association of Academies, but this did not survive the First World War. However, immediately upon the close of that conflict there was a marked acceleration in the formation of new international organizations in most of the fields of science and learning. The International Union of Academies and the International Research Council, later to become the International Council of Scientific Unions, succeeded the International Association of Academies. Most of the present international scientific unions were formed in the early postwar years, and so were such other organizations as the International Federation of Documentation, the International Committee of Historical Sciences, the Permanent International Committee of Linguists, to note only a very few.

It is to the League of Nations, however, that we must look for the establishment of the prototype of UNESCO. The Covenant of the League was silent as to the possible formation, under its auspices, of an international organization for the intellectual and spiritual *rapprochement* of the peoples of the world. Nevertheless, the matter was under discussion, and a report by a special committee pointed out that “no association of nations can hope to exist without a spiritual and intellectual understanding among all members,” while Gilbert Murray, United Kingdom representative in the Assembly of the League, urged the necessity for the formation of a “universal conscience.” Thus the International Committee of Intellectual Cooperation was created, which later expanded into the International Intellectual Cooperation Organization, with the Institute of Intellectual Cooperation in Paris as its operating agency.

The International Committee, which was a relatively small body of eminent personalities presided over in succession by Henri Bergson, the French philosopher, Dr. Lorentz, the Dutch physicist, and Gilbert Murray, the British classicist, was appointed by the Council of the League and reported to it. The expenses of its secretariat and of its meetings were met from an appropriation by the League, but the support of the Institute of Intellectual Cooperation was provided chiefly through a subsidy from the French government, with minor contributions from other governments and private sources.

The period of active work of the Organization was from 1922 to 1940, eighteen years during which a comprehensive program, chiefly in the fields of arts and letters, the sciences, the learned disciplines, and education, was developed. Important auxiliaries of the Organization, indeed integral parts of it, were the national committees of intellectual cooperation which were set up in most of the Member States of the League, and also in certain non-member States, notably the United States of America. Our country was represented in the International Committee of Intellectual Cooperation first by Robert A. Millikan, later by James T. Shotwell. Our national committee was formed by Millikan and reorganized and enlarged by Shotwell; it was wholly unofficial and depended upon private sources of support, notably the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation.

This is not the place to dwell upon the details of the program of the Intellectual Cooperation Organization of the League beyond pointing out that it was more comprehensive and more applicable to the vital interests of mankind than most of those who criticize it have acknowledged. The entire organization operated on a budget of less than five per cent of the present budget of UNESCO, and with a secretariat of much less than a tenth of the number of persons now assembled in Maison-UNESCO on the Avenue Kléber. Some of its enterprises have been incorporated in the program of UNESCO, and some of the enterprises of UNESCO were first planned in the Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, whose director was Henri Bonnet, now Ambassador of France in Washington. It was not, however, a movement of peoples, nor a movement in which large popular participation was likely. In spite of the



keen interest displayed by a fair number of American scientists, scholars, educators, writers, and artists, it was relatively little known in our academic and other intellectual circles. Nevertheless it sunk the roots from which UNESCO was to spring.

### III

Of special significance for the purposes of this review was the recognition by the government of the United States, during the decade of the thirties, that cultural and intellectual relations constitute an important aspect of the general international relations of the country, and indeed of the government's foreign policy.

Early signs of such recognition had been the remission of the Boxer Rebellion Indemnity in favor of scholarships in the United States for Chinese students; the payment from public funds of the dues of the United States in certain of the international scientific unions; participation by the government in the Pan-American Scientific Congress; adherence to the Inter-American Institute of Geography and History; and finally the signing and ratification of the Buenos Aires Convention of 1936 for the promotion of cultural relations among the American States.

This last act was especially significant, for it placed our government under treaty obligation to take an active and supporting part in international cultural exchanges, and led to the establishment within the Department of State in 1938 of a new sort of agency, the Division of Cultural Relations. From this point on, the activity of the government in the cultural area of international relations has steadily increased and ramified. Numerous temporary or permanent agencies throughout the government have taken part in these activities, which have been, to a certain extent, co-ordinated through an interdepartmental committee set up for the purpose.

This is not the occasion for discussion of the various programs of international cultural relations which have been carried on under the auspices of the government and with its support. They include the appointment of cultural attachés in our embassies and legations abroad, the exchange of students and teachers, the establishment of American libraries in many countries, the organiza-

tion of travelling exhibitions, assistance to American schools and "cultural institutes" in foreign countries, translations of American books into other languages, and many other activities of related nature.

Certain fundamental problems have emerged, the first of which is that of distinguishing between cultural exchanges for their own sake or for purely cultural objectives, and such exchanges as a part of national propaganda for the achievement of national purposes mainly political or economic in character. This problem we shall always have with us, and it illustrates some of the difficulties of carrying on international cultural relations initiated and supported by government.

A second problem is that not only of enlisting general interest in and approval of the various programs, but also of securing the most competent advice as to their character. An initial step for this purpose was taken by the Department of State in 1939, when it invited some 2000 American educators, scientists, scholars, writers, artists, librarians, publishers, and others interested in international cultural activities to attend a series of conferences devoted to various subject matters. The conferences were organized in such a way as to provide opportunity for full discussion of the government's problems in cultural relations, and out of them came a group of small continuation committees which functioned as specialized advisory bodies to the Department. Never before in the history of the United States, and probably never before in the history of any other country, had there been such a broad consultation on matters of foreign policy. Ever since 1939 consultation, though not on so grand a scale, has been continuous, and it is safe to say that the opinions and counsel of persons qualified by experience and special competence to advise on matters of international cultural relations have been the basis and often the origin of most of the government's acts and decisions in that area of policy.

It was against this background of growing interest and of active cooperation between government and the public that the idea of UNESCO took form and developed.

The idea had its exponents without as well as within the United States. The German occupation of Paris in 1940 closed the

Institute of Intellectual Cooperation as an international center, and the Committee of Intellectual Cooperation ceased to hold its meetings in Geneva. In many countries, however, intellectuals looked forward to the restoration, in some form, of the Intellectual Cooperation Organization, and the resumption of its activities.

In London the governments in exile formed a standing Conference of Allied Ministers of Education, the chief purpose of which was to make plans for the educational reconstruction of their respective countries when these should be freed from invading forces.

In the United States, on February 14, 1943, a preliminary unofficial conference of educators and others was held in Washington, called by Grayson N. Kefauver, Dean of the School of Education of Stanford University, who had secured leave of absence from this position and a small subvention from the Columbia Foundation of San Francisco, for the purpose of canvassing the possibility of establishing an International Office of Education as soon as the war should be ended. Discussions of a related nature had been going on at New York University, and also in numerous university and other educational groups.

The immediate objective of Kefauver's move was to endeavor to bring all organizations and groups interested in the idea into working cooperative relations, and in due time this was accomplished by the formation of the so-called "Liaison Committee" of which Dr. Kefauver was made Chairman. The organization of this committee was welcomed by Under-Secretary of State Sumner Welles when he assured Chairman Kefauver that "the Department will welcome the considered views of a representative group of the educators of the country with regard to the important rôle which educational activities will be called upon to play in the postwar period."

It would make a long story to recount the activities and developments which followed upon the organization of the Liaison Committee. One of the most interesting was the holding of three "International Assemblies," in which unofficial representatives of invaded and other countries discussed needs of educational reconstruction, and drafted a forecast of UNESCO itself in the form

of proposals for an international education organization which should include "cultural development" in its range of interest.

The following year the Department of State named Kefauver a consultant and sent him to London to maintain liaison with the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education. And so, out of the discussions in London and in the United States, there emerged a draft plan for an international organization devoted to educational and cultural matters. This draft plan was fully and widely discussed in the United States and in its final form represented a general consensus.

Meanwhile the Charter of the United Nations was being drawn up in San Francisco, in which, not without difficulty, recognition of educational and cultural matters as a concern of the United Nations found a place. The British and French governments joined in extending an invitation to the Member States of the United Nations Organization to send representatives to a conference to be held in London in November, 1945, for the formation of an international organization devoted to educational, scientific, and cultural interests and the adoption of its constitution.

#### IV

The form of organization provided in the Constitution of UNESCO is relatively simple. It consists of the General Conference, the Executive Board, and the Secretariat. The General Conference meets annually, and consists of the delegates of the Member States; these are named by their governments, and are not to exceed five from each State. This body has full power, adopts the program and establishes the budget, and is the seat of final authority. The Executive Board of 18 members, elected by the General Conference from among the delegates of the Member States, is charged with the execution of the program, the preparation of the agenda of the General Conference, the drafting of the program, the nomination of the Director General, and the exercise of such powers as may be delegated to it by the General Conference.

The Director General is appointed by the General Conference, upon nomination by the Executive Board, for a term of six years. He is the chief administrative officer and appoints the staff of the

Secretariat in accordance with regulations approved by the General Conference.

In addition to the central organization just described, there are National Commissions in the various Member States which are so constituted as to represent the principal national voluntary organizations interested in education, science, and culture, as well as the government itself. These National Commissions may be, and in a few instances already are, exceedingly important working parts of UNESCO at the national level, and more will be said of them later.

Such, then, is the structure of UNESCO. The first Director General, Julian Huxley, British zoologist, served for two years, from 1946 to 1948, and has been succeeded by Jaime Torres Bodet, elected by the last General Conference just held in Beirut. Director General Bodet, who resigned his post of Minister of Foreign Affairs in Mexico to accept the position, was recently Minister of Education of Mexico, and is a writer of distinction. He was the Chief of the Mexican Delegation to the London Conference of 1945, and had an important part in drafting the Constitution of UNESCO.

The headquarters of UNESCO was established in Paris on the Avenue Kléber near the Place de l'Étoile, in the vast structure which was built as the Hotel Majestic. The secretariat consists of more than 700 persons, organized in departments according to major divisions of the program. The Deputy Director General, Walter Laves, formerly of the University of Chicago and more recently of the U. S. Bureau of the Budget, is in general charge of administration.

The budget of UNESCO, which amounts this year to slightly under \$7,800,000, is assured by contributions apportioned among the Member States. The contribution of the United States, which has been as high as 44% of the total amount, is this year set at about 39%, or approximately \$3,120,000. The principle has been adopted, however, that after 1951 no Member State shall contribute more than a third of the total budget.

UNESCO is one of the "specialized agencies" established by intergovernmental agreement and having wide international responsibilities in economic, social, cultural, educational, health,

and related fields, which, under Article 57 of the Charter of the United Nations, are brought into relationship with the latter through the Economic and Social Council. UNESCO is an autonomous body and not a branch or division of the United Nations Organization, but the latter may make recommendations with respect to its activities and budget, and an agreement between the two bodies regulates their relations with each other.<sup>1</sup>

The present membership of UNESCO includes 47 countries, of which 43 are also members of the United Nations. The latter may of right become members of UNESCO by accepting and subscribing to its Constitution; countries not members of the United Nations may become members of UNESCO after recommendation by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations Organization and two-thirds vote of the General Conference of UNESCO.

A notable absence in the membership of UNESCO is that of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. As a member of the United Nations the U.S.S.R. had the right and was invited to participate in the organization of UNESCO, but declined to take part in the London Conference for reasons that were never made clear. As a member of the United Nations the U.S.S.R. has the right to assume membership in UNESCO at any time, but has never indicated any interest in doing so. Two of the Member States of UNESCO now dominated by the U.S.S.R. have, however, continued their membership, namely Poland and Czechoslovakia. Concerning these Member States it is pertinent to note that neither sent delegates to the recent General Conference in Beirut, and that at the General Conference in Mexico City the actions of the Polish delegation made it clear that this delegation acted at the behest of the U.S.S.R. These developments together with the recent withdrawal of the U.S.S.R. from the World Health Organization, the only specialized agency of the United Nations in which the U.S.S.R. held membership, would seem to indicate that the U.S.S.R. views with disfavor and intends to keep clear of international organizations whose work involves the exchange of educational, cultural, and scientific ideas and information and to present the question whether the U.S.S.R. will long permit the Member States of UNESCO which it dominates to continue their membership.

<sup>1</sup> The other specialized agencies with which UNESCO has closest contacts are the Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Health Organization.



## V

The purposes of UNESCO have been described many times with much persuasive eloquence. The famous first clause of the Preamble of the Constitution, which declares "that since wars begin in the minds of men it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed," is an arrangement by Archibald MacLeish of a phrase in the address to the London Conference by Prime Minister Attlee. The Preamble concludes with the declaration that the signatory governments "create the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization for the purpose of advancing, through the educational and scientific and cultural relations of the peoples of the world, the objectives of international peace and of the common welfare of mankind for which the United Nations Organization was established and which its Charter proclaims."

The Constitution further provides that to realize this purpose the Organization will "collaborate in the work of advancing the mutual knowledge and understanding of peoples...give fresh impulse to popular education and to the spread of culture...maintain, increase and diffuse knowledge."

A somewhat strict construction of the purposes of UNESCO has tended to limit its activities to undertakings which are designed to contribute to peace and security. Thus the advancement of knowledge for its own sake is not admitted to be an immediate objective of the Organization, and undertakings which seem likely to produce returns in the near future are preferred to long-term enterprises. It is recognized, however, that the constant increase of knowledge is essential to its validity and usefulness, and that the objectives of UNESCO are in reality long-term objectives. The problem of choice of activities, however, is relative rather than absolute, and during the short history of UNESCO we may observe shifts of emphasis, changes in interpretation and apparent inconsistencies.

The major thesis of UNESCO may be set forth as follows:

Education and knowledge are the necessary conditions of human well-being.

Knowledge of each other, among peoples, is essential to their mutual understanding.

Well-being and sympathetic mutual understanding are indispensable contributions to peace and security.

Unremitting effort must be made to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law, and for human rights and fundamental freedoms in order to assure a world climate favorable to the objectives of UNESCO.

Throughout the Constitution of UNESCO there is emphasis upon participation by peoples in the work of the organization, and the concepts of close cooperation between governments and their peoples and of direct relations among the peoples of the world are maintained with insistence. UNESCO is not merely an inter-governmental agency, although governments must accept responsibilities of support and leadership; it is also an association of peoples and their voluntary organizations working in the fields of education, science, and culture.

The test of UNESCO will not be in its declarations of objectives and principles and its advocacy of freedom and justice, nor in its eloquent expressions of desire to contribute to peace and security and to the common welfare of mankind, nor yet in its plans for undertakings designed to achieve these high purposes, important as such declarations and pronouncements may be for their influence upon the minds of men. The test of UNESCO will be more difficult of application than the test of "practical results" which it is urged to produce by those responsible for its support.

UNESCO has infinitely the most difficult task of all the agencies of the United Nations. A disease can be controlled or eradicated, and the benefits of such action can be observed and acclaimed by all; conditions of agriculture can be visibly improved and the production of food increased, and such gains can be measured and their results described in concrete terms. But the results achieved by UNESCO cannot be measured or appraised by such simple and objective methods. What "concrete" evidences can be advanced that the defenses of peace are actually being constructed in the minds of men, or that universal respect for justice, for the rule of law, and for human rights and fundamental freedoms is really being furthered?

UNESCO is working to bring about what Bishop Comenius described three hundred years ago as a "universal rededication of

minds... an internal peace of minds inspired by a system of ideas and feelings."

## VI

We cannot know what measures will surely and inevitably achieve the purpose of UNESCO; we can only choose such measures as, in the light of our experience and knowledge, seem best calculated to do so. The measures thus selected during the brief lifetime of the Organization constitute its program, to which we now turn our attention.

The Preparatory Commission, which existed between the close of the London Conference in November, 1945, and the holding of the first session of the General Conference, a year later, was swamped with proposals and plans from many countries and many groups. The General Conference had before it a bewildering number and variety of possibilities and was obliged first of all to establish reasonable criteria for the selection of those undertakings which should make up the program of the Organization.

It was agreed that the program must consist of enterprises which should advance the purpose of the Organization to contribute to peace and security, which should constitute a coherent whole, which should be practically feasible and appropriate, which should relate to matters of self-evident importance and usefulness, and which should be few in number. While the policy, thus bravely stated, has not always been followed, it has nevertheless formed the general basis of program making.

The formal program, as it emerged from the first session of the General Conference in Paris, was perhaps less a program than a collection of projects, many of which could not even be attempted; but the experience of the first year of work and the efforts of the General Conference in its second session, in Mexico City in November, 1947, reduced the collection to approximate order and sifted out much chaff. The second year of work provided a basis of experience and brought about a far better understanding, at least on the part of the Secretariat, with respect to the nature of the program, the appropriateness of its projects, and the possibility of execution. The Third Session of the General Conference in Beirut reached the stage of critical appraisal of plans and results,

and the program of 1949, though not greatly changed in substance from that of 1948, is better organized and the possibilities of realization are far greater. The program, however, still goes beyond the present means of accomplishment, and the first task of the new Director General and the Executive Board has been to select those parts which seem to be most urgent and most worthy of immediate attention and effort.

The program is now organized in seven chapters under the following headings:

- I. Educational Reconstruction
- II. Education
- III. The Natural Sciences
- IV. The Social Sciences
- V. Philosophy and the Humanistic Studies
- VI. Cultural Activities
- VII. Communication

Educational Reconstruction has held first priority among the immediate objectives of UNESCO since its organization. Indeed, the necessity of reconstructing the educational life of the countries devastated by the war was, for the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education, a prime motive for bringing about the creation of UNESCO itself. The most serious disagreement in the London Conference was as to whether UNESCO should be a direct relief agency or whether it should be an agency for stimulating and coordinating measures of relief. The view that it should perform the latter function prevailed, and has been amply justified by the results. UNESCO has been able to allot limited sums, aggregating less than a million dollars, from its own funds for certain emergency measures, but by far the greatest provision has been made through supplies and funds collected in the Member States of UNESCO by voluntary effort. In the United States the Commission for International Educational Reconstruction has been the agency for action in this field, and its efforts have resulted in contributions aggregating two hundred million dollars. At first ordinary school supplies, such as paper, pencils, and books, were solicited, but later attention was directed to scientific equipment and other needs of higher education and research. Cooperation by UNESCO with

the United Nations and others of the specialized agencies has been effective in such efforts as the "Children's Appeal," and the organization of volunteer work camps.

At Beirut the plight of nearly a million displaced Arabs was brought vividly to the attention of UNESCO, and the educational needs of their children have been included in the program of reconstruction. It is believed, however, that there can be a gradual tapering off during the next two years of the educational reconstruction effort, as applicable to the war-devastated countries, in favor of constructive efforts to develop the educational life of all countries in need of assistance.

The budget appropriation for 1949, under the heading of Reconstruction, is \$420,638.

In the general area of Education the principal plans in the UNESCO program have to do with fundamental education, the teaching of international understanding, and the improvement of textbooks and of university education. The total appropriation for this chapter, in 1949, is \$810,165.

The purpose of the work in fundamental education is not only to combat illiteracy but to encourage such education as will increase the physical, moral, and mental well-being of people now living at the lower levels of existence. Certain "pilot-projects" have been planned, in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, but only one of these has been started, in Haiti. In this island the Marbial Valley, an area of soil desolation and extreme poverty, was selected for the experiment, and the active cooperation of the Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Health Organization has been secured to deal with the situation. It has been necessary, first of all, to construct a road which would give year-round access to the area, and to assure the effective support, moral and financial, of the Haitian Government. After a period of discouraging trials it now seems probable that the project can be carried through to the point where national and local authorities can assume full responsibility. The experience gained in dealing with a situation of maximum difficulty will be valuable for all future efforts.

The work of UNESCO in promoting education for international understanding has focused upon teaching about the aims and work of the United Nations. A special seminar on the subject was held

at Adelphi College, Long Island, the past summer, under the direction of Dr. Y. R. Chao, and was attended by thirty-six teachers from twenty-five countries. Teaching materials have been prepared to assist teachers to present the subject in their schools, and an essay contest for school children has been organized.

Special attention has been given to the improvement of school textbooks, a matter to which the Intellectual Cooperation Organization of the League of Nations attached great importance, and Professor J. M. Quillen of Stanford University has spent the past year in the Secretariat of UNESCO preparing a statement of principles and criteria. The improvement in textbooks which is sought has to do with the treatment of subjects dealing with international relations in such a way as to produce understanding of other peoples rather than enmity toward them.

The chief effort of UNESCO in the field of university education is aimed at bringing about close relations among the universities of the world, and to that end a special conference of representatives of universities was held at Utrecht the past summer. At this conference, which was attended by Dr. George F. Zook, President of the American Council on Education, as principal representative of American universities, steps were taken leading to the organization of an International Association of Universities, and an International Universities Bureau. In addition, UNESCO has made a small grant to the International Association of University Professors and Lecturers for a preliminary study of the equivalence of degrees.

The area of the Natural Sciences is that in which the most concrete results have been obtained. This is chiefly because the scientists, already well organized at the international level, knew what they wanted and were on hand with specific plans.

First mention should be made of projects designed to increase our knowledge as to the better utilization of the areas of the world most unfavorable to human habitation. The first of these projects was to establish an international institute for the study of the Hylean Amazon region, and for the coordination of the work of several specialized national research institutes already set up in that area. The function of UNESCO has been to make plans, to interest the states having territory in the region in supporting the project, and to organize the necessary conferences. All this has



been done; eight countries have signed a cooperative agreement and subscribed funds.

UNESCO has assisted the work of Peru, Switzerland, and other countries in the study of biological and physical phenomena at high altitudes, and has included in the program of 1948 provision for assistance to the study of arid regions.

Activities of the sort just described are related to the general problems of conservation, food, and population. UNESCO has facilitated the organization of the International Union for the Protection of Nature, which will hold an international congress this coming summer, and is producing a series of pamphlets on the general topic, "Food and People," which will be widely distributed for discussion and educational use.

In order to advance scientific research in various parts of the world, centers known as Field Science Coordinating Offices have been established in Latin America (first at Rio de Janeiro but now at Montevideo), in the Middle East at Cairo, in East Asia at Nanking, and in South Asia at New Delhi. The purpose of these offices is to collect, exchange, and disseminate scientific information.

Finally, UNESCO assists the International Council of Scientific Unions and the individual unions themselves, by grants-in-aid or subsidies for conferences, preparation of tools of research, and similar purpose. The amount authorized for this purpose in the budget of 1949 is \$242,374 out of a total appropriation for scientific activities of \$679,505.

The Social Sciences furnish some of the most baffling problems with which UNESCO has to deal, and the selection of those projects which should most appropriately come within the program of the Organization is exceedingly difficult.

Chief attention is being devoted to the so-called "tensions projects," which may be briefly described as a series of studies bearing upon five related problems. The first of these inquiries is into the distinctive character of the various national cultures, ideas, and legal systems, "with the aim of correcting ignorance, misunderstanding and prejudice, and of promoting a true appreciation of the problems with which the nations are faced."

The second deals with the conceptions which the people of one

nation hold of their own and of other nations; the third is a study of modern techniques for changing social attitudes; the fourth has to do with influences which predispose towards international understanding or aggressive nationalism; while the fifth deals with the relations between population problems and technological changes on the one hand and international tensions on the other.

In addition to special conferences, organized to discuss the problems of the "tensions projects," preliminary studies have been made during the last year by two American social scientists temporarily attached to the Secretariat, Professor Hadley Cantril of Princeton University, and Professor Otto Klineberg of Columbia University, for the purpose of defining problems, developing methods of investigation, and securing cooperation from various countries. Other studies in the field of the social sciences have to do with methods and techniques of international collaboration in the consideration of political and economic problems, and with the objectives and methods of research in political science. The appropriation for social sciences in the budget of 1949 is \$286,514.

Although the humanities have a place to themselves in the program of 1949, these studies, which, after all, are central to the purposes of UNESCO, were, in the program for 1948, spread over chapters devoted to Human and Social Relations, Cultural Interchange, and Communication. It must be confessed that it is in this field that the program of UNESCO is least developed and has least benefited by proposals from scholars themselves.

For the present the principal interest of UNESCO is in the philosophical analysis of certain concepts. A volume constituting a digest of representative opinions on the philosophical principles of human rights has been edited and its publication may be expected this year. The International Congress of Philosophy, held in Amsterdam in 1948, and national associations of philosophers have been encouraged to organize symposia on pertinent subjects and several of these have found publication in philosophical reviews. For 1949 a world-wide discussion of the underlying philosophical principles of democracy will be undertaken through questionnaires, symposia, and conferences.

More concrete, in the area of the humanities, is the proposal by the United States that special attention should be paid to the dis-

cussion of methods of teaching foreign languages, in view of the progress made in that field during the war. It does not seem likely however that UNESCO will undertake to organize such a discussion on its own account since it does not have specialized staff competent for the purpose, but it may be referred to the International Committee of Linguists. The program of UNESCO also includes a provision that the organization shall assist Member States in reaching agreements as to conditions under which archaeological investigations may be permitted in their respective territories. The budget includes \$119,399 for the humanities.

The chapter on Cultural Activities, the budget allocation for which is \$523,667, is one of the most varied as to subject matter of the entire program. It includes the creative arts, the theatre, translations, libraries, and museums. In the field of literature the chief undertaking has been the organization of a literary pool, which is an arrangement with numerous literary reviews for exchange of their contents and also a sort of agency for the placement of unpublished articles. The success of this device has thus far been mediocre, and it may be doubted if the major reviews of the world will be interested in taking part in the exchange. The promotion of translations of great books has also received attention. In music the chief accomplishment has been to bring about the formation of the International Music Council, which should, and indeed probably will, become an active international agency for promoting relations among musicians and for the broad dissemination of musical works. In the field of the visual arts the chief undertaking has been to organize collections of fine reproductions of great paintings for distribution in countries where there are few originals. The place of the arts in general education has also received attention but is still in the discussion stage. At Beirut there was readopted a resolution of the first session of the General Conference calling upon UNESCO to defend the freedom of the artist and to institute an examination of the contributions which artists in all the arts can make towards furthering the purposes of UNESCO. The work of the organization as regards museums has been chiefly that of a clearing house; the publication of *Museum*, a periodical devoted to technical museum problems and to museography, continues the *Museum* of the Intellectual Cooperation Organization.

The program for libraries has been devoted chiefly to the promotion of public libraries by means of a summer school for public librarians and the development of public library manuals, to surveys of bibliographical services, the review of systems of classification through the International Federation of Library Associations, the international exchange of books, and the development of national bibliographies. Assistance has been given for the maintenance of the former German libraries in Italy until such time as they can be taken over by the Italian Government.

Conferences have been held to encourage the production of low-priced books and the reproduction of periodicals, while one of the most practical and concrete projects of UNESCO has been the setting up of the book-coupon scheme to facilitate the purchase by "soft-currency" countries of books produced in countries of "hard-currency."

The important subject of copyright has been assigned to UNESCO as the international agency of the United Nations most concerned with its numerous problems. At present a comparative study of national copyright systems, laws, practices, and procedures is being made with a view to the eventual drafting of a universal copyright convention.

Finally a new international association of archivists has been launched.

The chapter on Communication, to which the Budget allocates \$1,518,048, is related to the entire program. It deals with exchange of persons, obstacles to the free flow of information, radio, films, and press, and includes the projects division, which is a sort of central planning staff for the selection and development of themes for general discussion through the various media of mass communication. Great difficulty has been experienced in organizing work under this chapter, especially in fields of radio, films, and press, and the staff of the Secretariat to deal with these matters has not yet been completed.<sup>1</sup> Activities of exchange of persons have however been effectively carried on, and the funds made

<sup>1</sup> Since the above was written the appointment has been announced of Douglas H. Schneider as Director of Mass Communications Department of the UNESCO Secretariat. Mr. Schneider was recently Counsellor of the American Embassy in Paris for educational exchange, cultural, and information programs. He previously served in O.W.I. and had been program manager of station WRUL in Boston.

available for UNESCO fellowships make it possible to appoint about fifty persons for study in other countries than their own. For the most part these are mature persons who have been shut off during the war from ordinary intercourse with their colleagues in other countries and for whom fellowships offer opportunities to acquire useful information and experience. The fields of study for which such fellowships are available are science and social development, cinema and radio education, educational problems of war-affected children, librarianship, educational administration, and art and music education. UNESCO has also prepared a comprehensive manual of information respecting available fellowship opportunities, over ten thousand in number, in various countries.

The first draft convention prepared by UNESCO was adopted at Beirut and is now being submitted to Member States for signature. It has to do with international circulation of audio-visual materials of educational character and will take effect when signed and ratified by ten states.

Incomplete as this summary view of the program is, it is hoped that it may convey some notion, at least, of its more important features.

## VII

Reference has been made on several occasions to various international organizations which cooperate with UNESCO in carrying out its program. The position of these nongovernmental organizations, or "NGO's" as they are commonly styled, is of great and growing importance. First among them, as already pointed out, are the International Scientific Unions and their federation, the International Council of Scientific Unions. Others are the International Federation of Library Associations, the International Committee of Historical Sciences, the International Union of Academies, etc. With many such organizations UNESCO has entered into cooperative arrangements which permit assigning to them parts of the program within their fields of specialization, or making grants or subsidies to enable them to undertake tasks related to the work of UNESCO and of significance for the achievement of its objectives. UNESCO has also taken the initiative in bringing about the formation of organizations in fields where such

do not exist, or more often to organize federal bodies of existing organizations of related purposes. An example of such a federal body is the recently formed International Council for Philosophy and the Humanistic Studies, which brings together half a dozen of the most important international organizations in those fields and serves as a channel by means of which their working relationship to UNESCO may be established. Obviously, it is necessary to observe the greatest care and discretion in admitting these non-governmental organizations to cooperative arrangements. There are far too many which are international in name only or which are far from being representative of the fields which they profess to cultivate. Furthermore, it is of equal importance to study critically the results of operations which such bodies may undertake with the aid of subventions from UNESCO. But if all precautions are taken, such organizations may constitute an invaluable auxiliary of UNESCO, undertaking for it many specialized tasks which it could not accomplish for itself without much larger personnel than it should conceivably maintain. By means of these arrangements close contacts can be maintained between UNESCO and large bodies of specialists, and the interest of the latter can be enlisted on behalf of the UNESCO program.

Finally, we come to the visible evidence of UNESCO in the United States—the National Commission. The Constitution of UNESCO calls upon each Member State to take measures to associate its national organizations interested in education, science, and culture with its Government in the work of UNESCO, “preferably through the establishment of a National Commission.” Such a step was considered essential to broad popular participation in the activities of the Organization. This provision was long debated in the London conference, but the successful work of national committees on intellectual cooperation had demonstrated the great potentialities of such bodies, and the provision was adopted. Our Congress, in a Joint Resolution of June 30, 1946, instructed the Secretary of State to establish such a commission, and authorized the Department of State to furnish to it the “necessary secretariat.” The U. S. National Commission for UNESCO, which is the name it has adopted, is composed of one hundred persons, citizens of the United States, sixty of whom are



designated by the chief national voluntary organizations interested in education, science, and culture, and forty are named by the Secretary of State. Of this latter number ten represent the Federal Government, fifteen represent State and local governments, and fifteen are appointments at large. Members serve terms of three years each, but not more than two successive terms, and are forbidden to receive compensation for their services. Officers of the Commission are elected annually, but may not serve for more than three successive years.

The selection, by the Department of State, of the sixty organizations which should designate members of the National Commission was not an easy or a comfortable task. The Commission is authorized to review the list of such organizations from time to time, and thus there is established a system of slow irregular rotation, the operation of which, however, is by no means painless.

The present list of organizations includes the major research councils, the chief educational organizations, including of course the American Association of University Professors, a few specialized scientific or scholarly bodies, professional and religious organizations, organizations of libraries and museums, associations of artists, writers and musicians, labor unions, agricultural and business groups, and associations devoted to the interests of women and youth.

The major function of the Commission is to carry out the program of UNESCO at the national level. This is done by means of a standing Committee on UNESCO Program and through assignments of parts of the program to selected organizations or to panels or committees created for the purpose. Thus the section of the program on the natural sciences is assigned to the National Research Council, which has set up a special committee to deal with it and has assumed responsibility for carrying it out. In the field of education certain specific projects have been assigned to the American Council on Education; the area of fundamental education has been taken on by the U. S. Office of Education; while other projects have been assigned to panels representative of the different educational groups. To the present time more than forty specific program assignments have been made.

The other most important phase of the work of the National

Commission is that of encouraging wide popular interest and participation in the activities of UNESCO. Three national or regional conferences have been held: in Philadelphia in March, 1947, in Denver in May of the same year, and in San Francisco in May, 1948. A fourth conference, the second of the series of National Conferences, is being held in Cleveland in March-April, 1949. The attendance at these conferences, furnished by representatives of all organizations interested in the work of UNESCO, has ranged from a thousand to more than two thousand persons, and the discussions, devoted to specified subjects, has been lively and fruitful. The conferences have demonstrated that throughout the nation there is more than interest in UNESCO—there is an earnest desire to have an effective share in its work and program and to advance its purposes. This interest is assuming the proportions of a genuine movement, and the problem of the National Commission is to furnish guidance and to propose specific activities which can be carried on by local and regional groups. In some States there have been formed State Councils for UNESCO which are proving to be useful agencies.

The National Commission has also specific and general advisory functions: to advise the government respecting the composition and instructions of the delegations to the General Conference of UNESCO, and also to advise respecting all matters relating to the Organization.

The operating agency of the National Commission is its secretariat, which is also a division of the Department of State—UNESCO Relations Staff—under the supervision of the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, at present Mr. George V. Allen. The Executive Secretary of the Commission, Mr. Charles A. Thomson, is director of the Staff, the personnel of which, numbering about forty-five, is composed of administrative officers and professionals of special competence in the various fields of UNESCO interests. The quality of this personnel is of the highest, and its devotion and enthusiasm can hardly be surpassed in any branch of the Government. The current appropriation for the expenses of the National Commission and its secretariat is approximately \$230,000.

\* \* \*

This, then, is the present state of UNESCO. Those of us who have been in continuous contact with its activities during the past three years, and who have had some responsibility for them, have confidence in their progressive success. The ultimate achievement of the objectives of UNESCO is still far beyond us, and few of us can expect to witness it in our own times. We are aware of the formidable obstacles which will have to be overcome, but we have faith and are determined to justify that faith, so far as it is in our power to do so, by our works.

## LET'S KICK OUT OUR SOCIALISM

By JAMES URVIN RUNDLE

Ohio University

With all our bother about better teaching methods, more vital curricula, higher scholastic standards, and the like, it seems to me that we have overlooked the one thing needed for the profession today—incentive. I have been reminded of this fact by the reaction of the American Medical Association to certain motions in the direction of Socialized Medicine.

My M.D. friends tell me that Socialized Medicine is bad chiefly because it would remove this very necessary yeast, incentive, from the professional loaf. "Give a doctor a stated salary," they say, "and a given number of patients that he *has* to take care of, and you'll find him doing slipshod work. Why? Because you've taken away his incentive, and it's just not human nature to work your best without incentive."

I think that my friends must be right. Every day the manufacturers and their spokesmen assure us that our economic welfare can be maintained only if the incentive of unregulated profits is not removed. We all remember the bare grocery shelves that confronted us in the dying days of OPA.

Indeed, we appear to be the one important professional group out of step in the matter of controls. It may be objected that the ministry feels the same restraint, but a clergyman has room in his schedule for sidelines—weddings, funerals, christenings—any of which may bring in a tidy sum. Quite obvious professional ethics bar the professor from the sideline of tutoring in his own college.

It is a serious matter indeed that this deadening control should be applied to the very activity which everyone agrees is first in importance to an effective democracy. How appalled the gentlemen of medicine and industry must be at the prospect of sending their sons and daughters to be educated and trained by persons

caught in a system whose evils they know so well! How can they indifferently entrust this vital matter to hands necessarily "slipshod"? True, all my colleagues *seem* to put forth their best—I know none who stint time or effort in class preparations, student conferences, and so on. But the evils of education, unlike those of medicine or production, are not easily discovered or measured. And it is not reasonable to suppose that a formula applicable to one profession or business is not applicable to another.

It seems clear that something should be done, and at once, to put the incentive motive into the work of the academic profession. Any change, of course, necessitates adjustments which may present new problems, I admit. Some of my colleagues with whom I have discussed this proposal fear that if it were adopted many of our youth would be deprived of educational opportunities, but I cannot see how such a result would follow in education more than in medicine. If it is professional quality we are after and if incentive is essential to good professional performance, our first concern should be with professional quality in our institutions of higher education, even though many of our youth could not afford the price.

Probably we could never expect our fees to equal those of the doctors, but I can see the face of the professor light up with pleasure if, after an hour's hard labor on an individual student's problem, he could present a bill for, say, \$20. My own doctor charges me (after deduction for materials) about \$30 an hour. I don't know about the manufacturers. My field is English, not mathematics, and large figures confuse me. I believe that the average college teacher with a doctorate gets less than \$6.00 per hour for time spent in teaching his classes and in student conferences. He receives no remuneration for the long hours spent in preparation for his classes, in grading papers, and for his work on committees. And, of course, his productive years are—socialistically—limited by early mandatory retirement, a practice that obtains in none of the other learned professions.

Professors are expected, and are frequently admonished, by industrialists, doctors, lawyers, spokesmen for patriotic societies, and university presidents to teach the values of our free enterprise system. Occasionally we are told that our free enterprise system

is the basis of academic freedom. "Indeed, academic freedom is nothing more than the specific application of the freedom inherent in the American way of life. It follows that to protect academic freedom the teacher must support the entire free system which, among other things, guarantees freedom for all." So spoke General Dwight D. Eisenhower on the occasion of his inauguration as President of Columbia University. While it is debatable that a majority of the academic profession would concur in this view, there is no doubt that an overwhelming majority of the profession is made up of those who believe in and support capitalism and free enterprise. It would seem, therefore, that it is high time for the profession to practice what it believes in and advocates, and to take steps promptly to kick out our socialism.



## ARE WE AFRAID OF FREEDOM?<sup>1</sup>

*A Statement from the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the University of Chicago*

*It has been well said...that "Chicago is proud of its University, one of the greatest in the world." ...We have become thoroughly convinced by this investigation that one of the greatest safeguards for the perpetuation of American idealism and American institutions lies in the absolute scholastic freedom of our universities and that the University of Chicago is an admirable example of how that freedom should be exercised....Any action on our part which would even indirectly hamper that scholastic freedom which our schools enjoy would indeed be subversive of the very principles underlying our form of government.*

MAJORITY REPORT, Illinois State  
Legislative Committee Authorized  
to Investigate the University of  
Chicago, June 26, 1935

In 1935 the Legislature of the State of Illinois empowered a committee to investigate alleged seditious activities at the University of Chicago. Charges were made. Damaging surmises were printed in the public press. The work of the University was interrupted. At the conclusion of the investigation the committee wrote in its report:

Has the University of Chicago or any of its professors violated either the letter or the spirit of our laws? The answer to this question must be in the negative....*Nothing in the teachings or schedule of the school can be held to be subversive of our institutions or the advocacy of the communist form of government as a substitution for the present form of government of the United States.*

<sup>1</sup> Reprinted through the courtesy of Mr. Laird Bell, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the University of Chicago.

The committee cleared the University. But a university is dependent on the public's appraisal of its contribution, and harm had already been done. Even the generosity of Mr. Walgreen, who contributed five hundred and fifty thousand dollars to the University after the investigation was closed, did not remove the impression created by the headline charges.

A serious question is again raised by an investigating committee of the Illinois Legislature. The question is fundamental to democracy. It underlies all scholarship and all thoughtful inquiry. Therefore, it underlies the very purpose of a great university. The question is this: In these troubled times are we afraid of freedom?

This year on March 1, 1949, a group of students from Illinois universities, including a number of students from the University of Chicago, travelled to Springfield to protest the five bills introduced into the state legislature by Senator Paul Broyles. This they had the right to do. If they were disorderly, we disapprove of their conduct. Immediately following this student protest, House Joint Resolution No. 21 was passed calling for an investigation of the University and stating: "It appears that these students are being indoctrinated with Communist and other subversive theories contrary to our free systems of representative government...." This resolution was passed within a few minutes, without customary hearings or referral to committee.

## II

So, once again apparently the University is to be "investigated." Once again statements harmful to the University's reputation have been made. We think that the people who have made these statements do not know the facts. Most of the statements are untrue. But the newspaper reader is likely to assume that "where there's smoke, there's fire." Therefore, this statement is being made. The truth does not lie somewhere between the allegations of irresponsible individuals and our statement of it. The facts spell the truth, and the truth is the opposite of the charges.

*There is no Communist professor at the University of Chicago.*

*There is no Communist indoctrination at the University of Chicago in any course or program in its curriculum.*

We know that there is a Communist Club at the University—one of some two hundred student organizations. We know also that its membership comprises one-tenth of one per cent of the total student body, about one out of every thousand. The Board, which controls and directs the affairs of this University, could refuse to recognize that organization. But we believe with Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes that “with effervescent opinions . . . the quickest way to let them get flat is to let them get exposed to the air.”

Communism is a term which is used loosely by different people to mean different things. Not everyone who advocates change is a Communist. In times when there is fear of Communist infiltration many persons are afraid of any criticism of things as they are. There is a tendency at such times to put a “red” label on anyone with whose opinions one may not agree. Universities have as much duty to defend the free expression of opinion within the bounds of legality as they have to prevent what is illegal. If such defense subjects the University to the harassment of a legislative investigation and to the possibility of inadequate or distorted reports of it, we shall nevertheless defend the University’s principles with all the vigor we can command.

### **The Tradition of Individual Freedom**

The Trustees and Administration of this University are against communism. They are against it because, among other reasons, it is contrary to our free tradition. Communism suppresses ideas. We oppose communism as we oppose all efforts to undermine our constitutionally guaranteed free speech, free press, and free assembly. We oppose communism because we believe in the tradition of individual freedom which men throughout the centuries have fought to preserve. This tradition has been stated by many men in many ways. A few of these statements follow:

JOHN MILTON, *Arcopagitica* (1644):

Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely

according to conscience, above all liberties. . . . And though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so Truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and Falsehood grapple; who ever knew Truth put to the worse, in a free and open encounter?

THOMAS JEFFERSON, "First Inaugural Address" (1801):

If there be any among us who wish to dissolve this union, or change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed, as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it.

JOHN STUART MILL, *On Liberty* (1859):

This, then, is the appropriate region of human liberty. It comprises, first, the inward domain of consciousness; demanding liberty of conscience, in the most comprehensive sense; liberty of thought and feeling; absolute freedom of opinion and sentiment on all subjects, practical or speculative, scientific, moral, or theological.

WOODROW WILSON, "Message to Congress" (1919):

The only way to keep men from agitating against grievances is to remove the grievances. An unwillingness even to discuss these matters produces only dissatisfactions and gives comfort to the extreme elements in our country which endeavor to stir up disturbances in order to provoke Governments to embark upon a course of retaliation and repression. The seed of revolution is repression.

OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, *Abrams v. United States* (1919):

But when men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market. . . .

LOUIS D. BRANDEIS, *Gilbert v. Minnesota* (1920):

The right of a citizen of the United States to take part, for his own or the country's benefit, in the making of federal laws and in the conduct of the government, necessarily includes the right

to speak or write about them; to endeavor to make his own opinion concerning laws existing or contemplated prevail; and to this end, to teach the truth as he sees it. . . . Like the course of the heavenly bodies, harmony in national life is a resultant of the struggle between contending forces. In frank expression of conflicting opinion lies the greatest promise of wisdom in governmental action; and in suppression lies ordinarily the greatest peril.

CHARLES EVANS HUGHES, Letter to Speaker Sweet of the New York State Legislature, reported in the *New York Times*, January 10, 1920:

If public officers or private citizens have any evidence that any individual or group of individuals are plotting revolution and seeking by violent measures to change our Government, let the evidence be laid before the proper authorities and swift action be taken for the protection of the community. Let every resource of inquiry, of pursuit, of prosecution be employed to ferret out and punish the guilty according to our laws. But I count it a most serious mistake to proceed, not against individuals charged with violation of law, but against masses of our citizens combined for political action, by denying them the only resource of peaceful government: that is, action by the ballot box and through duly elected representatives in legislative bodies.

ALFRED E. SMITH, in his message vetoing the Lusk Laws, which sought to license schools and to require teachers' oaths (1919):

Its avowed purpose is to safeguard the institutions and traditions of the country. In effect, it strikes at the very foundation of one of the most cardinal institutions of our nation—the fundamental right of the people to enjoy full liberty in the domain of idea and speech. To this fundamental right there is and can be under our system of government but one limitation, namely, that the law of the land shall not be transgressed, and there is abundant statute law prohibiting the abuse of free speech. . . . The profound sanity of the American people has been demonstrated in many a crisis, and I, for one, do not believe that governmental dictation of what may and may not be taught is necessary to achieve a continuance of the patriotism of our citizenship and its loyal support of the government and its institutions.

### The Tradition Continues

Opinions such as these are often unpopular, especially when they are spoken in times of stress. But they have been stated again

and again by men who were not isolated thinkers but men of action. It is fortunate that in the midst of our present apprehensions and alarms America does not lack men of the courage to continue the democratic tradition.

ROBERT A. TAFT, "The Battle Against Communism," address to the Executives Club of Milwaukee, May 8, 1948:

There has been a good deal of talk of outlawing the Communist Party. Of course, under our Constitution, we cannot and should not make it illegal for an American citizen to think communism or express his opinions as long as he does not advocate a violent overthrow of the government. We cannot afford, if we are going to maintain freedom in this country, to violate the Constitution. We would be killing the very liberty which it is the purpose of our whole policy to preserve against totalitarian attack.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, Installation Address as President of Columbia University, the expression of his administrative policy, October 12, 1948:

There will be no administrative suppression or distortion of any subject that merits a place in this University's curricula. The facts of communism, for instance, shall be taught here—its ideological development, its political methods, its economic effects, its probable course in the future. The truth about communism is, today, an indispensable requirement if the true values of our democratic system are to be properly assessed. Ignorance of communism, fascism, or any other police-state philosophy is far more dangerous than ignorance of the most virulent disease.

Who among us can doubt the choice of future Americans, as between statism and freedom, if the truth concerning each be constantly held before their eyes? But if we, as adults, attempt to hide from the young the facts in this world struggle, not only will we be making a futile attempt to establish an intellectual "iron curtain," but we will arouse the lively suspicion that statism possesses virtues whose persuasive effect we fear.

WILBUR J. BENDER, Dean of Harvard College, in the March, 1949, issue of the *Harvard Alumni Bulletin* answered those who criticized Harvard for permitting Gerhart Eisler to speak before the John Reed Society:

I know of no faster way of producing communists than by making martyrs out of the handful of communists we now have.



Forbidding them to speak would be not only treason to the ancient traditions of Harvard and America: It would be proof that we have something to hide, that we have lost faith in our principles and in our way of life. It would be accepting communist practices in the name of Americanism. . . . I devoutly hope that the time will never come when we are faced with the sorry spectacle of a great University and a great country trembling timorously in fear of the words of a communist or of a demagogic commentator.

### What About Spies?

Today, some men devoted to freedom are worried about spies. They would "get rid of all the reds" to eliminate the possibility of espionage. We, too, are against spies. But not everyone who is called "red" is a spy. And, more important, not all spies announce themselves as "reds." The danger, if any, does not exist with the noisy agitators. The University of Chicago is engaged in secret projects of vital importance to national defense. The University is under surveillance of professional investigators, agents of the F.B.I. and of the military intelligence units. This, we think, is the way to look for spies. The general suppression of "reds" is too simple, too amateurish to be effective. J. Edgar Hoover, head of the F.B.I., is against it.

### The Atomic Bomb

*"The Italian navigator has landed in the New World, and the natives are friendly."*

In this cryptic message, so legend has it, the news of Enrico Fermi's successful operation of the atomic "pile" under the grandstand of Stagg Field at the University of Chicago was flashed to Washington on December 2, 1942. It meant that the chain reaction worked, and the first unleashing of atomic energy was under control.

The chain reaction made possible the most terrible weapon in history. It created the greatest economic fact of our time. It opened up endless new vistas for scientific accomplishment.

The work on the atomic bomb took great scientists. It also took great courage. Had it failed, the University might have

been charged with the most spectacular boondoggle of all time. Or without the adequate calculations and protections which its scientists provided, the University might have been responsible for blowing up the northern end of Illinois.

The chain reaction is in a sense only a symbol of the working of freedom in ideas. It is no accident that the world's leading scientists wish to work in the free atmosphere provided by a great university. Freedom is the necessary condition of learning and progress.

Its contribution to the successful production of the atomic bomb was but one facet of the University's wartime activity. Its alumni and its staff served valiantly. It provided numerous trained individuals for positions of grave responsibility. Its facilities were mobilized and its activities ranged from interpretation and training in Chinese dialects and the prediction of weather in the Arctic region to the development of numerous protective measures for armed forces personnel. The University of Chicago has been honored by the Secretary of War for "contributing materially to the successful conclusion of World War II."

### **The Market Place of Free Ideas**

This University was founded and rose to international prominence under circumstances which are possible only in a free and democratic state. Free interchange of ideas, free research, and the right of its faculty members to engage without restraint in the activities dictated by their judgment and their conscience have been protected and encouraged. Out of this freedom have come the renowned contributions of this University to the humanities and to the physical sciences, the social sciences, and the biological sciences.

The galaxy of Midwest state universities—Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Iowa—could scarcely have come to their current high standards without the compelling influence of the University of Chicago.

EDWIN R. EMBREE, *Harper's Magazine*, March, 1949

It was in an atmosphere of freedom that A. A. Michelson,

earliest American physicist to win the Nobel Prize, measured the diameter of a star for the first time; James H. Breasted, America's first professor of Egyptology, furthered the understanding and reconstruction of ancient society; Robert A. Millikan won the Nobel Prize for measuring the charge of the electron; Edgar J. Goodspeed achieved the status of the nation's foremost New Testament scholar; Arno Luckhardt discovered ethylene gas, used as an anesthetic in millions of operations; Frank Billings demonstrated that teeth and tonsils can be focal centers for the spread of infection. Arthur H. Compton won the Nobel Prize for his pioneer work on X-rays; Charles Merriam rose to eminence as a scholar and teacher of American political thought; Arthur J. Dempster isolated uranium 235, the atomic explosive—these men and the host of their distinguished colleagues produced the achievements which have placed this University among the foremost in the world.

Some day I would like to take a year off, return to Chicago, and write a book about the University of Chicago, which by any reckoning is one of the three or four most outstanding in the world.

JOHN GUNTHER, *Inside USA*

It is in that freedom that the men of the University work today to find a cure for cancer, to harness atomic energy for peaceful productive use, to widen our knowledge of the social, political, and cultural forces in all human experience, and to train the teachers, the scientists, the scholars, and the enlightened citizens of tomorrow. It is upon that freedom that the future promise of the University is dependent. As Norman Cousins, editor of the *Saturday Review of Literature*, wrote in an editorial:

For it is that environment rather than any dogma that represents the real Chicago Story. It is impossible to spend any time on the campus without sensing the vitality of true academic freedom—not the academic freedom which limits itself (instead of being limited from without) to stump speeches or political activity, but the academic freedom which Holmes used to call the open market place of ideas. The spirit of independence, particularly as it applies to research... gives Chicago both its dominant characteristics and its chief claim on the future.

To be great, a university must adhere to principle. It cannot shift with the winds of passing public opinion. Its work is frequently mystifying and frequently misunderstood. It must rely for its support upon a relatively small number of people who understand the important contributions it makes to the welfare of the community and the improvement of mankind; upon those who understand that academic freedom is important not because of its benefits to professors but because of its benefits to all of us.

Today our tradition of freedom is under attack. There are those who are afraid of freedom. We do not share these fears. The University of Chicago needs the support of those who believe as we do.

LAIRD BELL, *Chairman*, The Board of Trustees,  
The University of Chicago, April 11, 1949

---

*Are We Afraid of Freedom?* by Laird Bell was written upon the announcement that an investigation would be held to determine whether there are subversive activities at the University of Chicago. Mr. Bell is Chairman of the University's Board of Trustees. He is also Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Carleton College and an Overseer of Harvard University. He is senior partner in the Chicago law firm of Bell, Boyd, Marshall and Lloyd, and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Weyerhaeuser Timber Company.

In March, 1949, the Illinois Legislature empowered the Seditious Activities Investigating Commission to investigate "all subversive activities which may now exist in any connection whatsoever at the University of Chicago and at Roosevelt College." According to the joint resolution calling for the investigation this action was precipitated by the appearance before the Commission of a group which included a number of students from Illinois colleges and universities who travelled to Springfield to express opposition to five bills pending in the House. These bills sought to outlaw the Communist Party, to require loyalty oaths of teachers, and to establish as felonies participation in Communist or Communist-front organizations.

From the University of Chicago, Robert M. Hutchins, Chan-

cellor, and the Reverend John B. Thompson, Dean of Rockefeller Memorial Chapel, were subpoenaed to appear before the Commission. Several University of Chicago students were also subpoenaed.

The Commission employed J. B. Matthews as its chief investigator and called as its principal witnesses, Howard Rushmore, reporter for the New York *Journal American*, and John Madigan, reporter for the Chicago *Herald-American*.

In his testimony Chancellor Hutchins stated:

The policy of repression of ideas cannot work and never has worked. The alternative to it is the long, difficult road of education. To this the American people have been committed. It requires patience and tolerance, even in the face of intense provocation. It requires faith in the principles and practices of democracy, faith that when the citizen understands all forms of government he will prefer democracy and that he will be a better citizen if he is convinced than he would be if he were coerced.

It is assumed that in his testimony Howard Rushmore used a document published by an organization known as the National Council for American Education. This document, "Red-Ucators at the University of Chicago," is similar to one published earlier concerning Harvard University. Rushmore cited names of faculty members who were said to have held membership or to have endorsed activities sponsored by so-called Communist-front organizations.

After analyzing the charges made by Howard Rushmore, seven full professors—James L. Adams, Ernest W. Burgess, Robert J. Havighurst, Wayne McMillen, Malcolm P. Sharp, Rexford G. Tugwell, and Harold C. Urey—filed affidavits in reply. Several weeks later subpoenas were issued calling these men to a re-opened session of the hearings. Laird Bell, although not subpoenaed, agreed to appear before the Commission.

During the first hearings of the Commission, which lasted three days, no evidence was introduced to prove that any member of the faculty of the University of Chicago was a Communist or was sympathetic with Communist aims.

Three of the five faculty members who were subpoenaed inquired at the hearings as to whether they were charged with sub-

versive teaching. The Chairman of the Commission replied that they were not. No new evidence was produced at these re-opened hearings. In an attempt to prove Communist indoctrination, an optional reading recommended to students in the College was introduced. This was a selection from "The Pattern of American Culture," by Robert Lynd, Professor of Sociology at Columbia University. The general effect was that the Commission was basing its action on innuendo, hearsay, false charges, and a strange conception of what American education should be.

Since the conclusion of the hearings the Commission has issued a statement signed by eleven of its fifteen members censuring the University and threatening the suspension of tax-exemption privileges. Two members of the Commission have issued dissenting statements.

Representative Charles J. Jenkins, a member of the Commission, wrote in his dissenting statement:

We do not agree, however, with the findings of the majority in their press statements on the investigation, recently concluded, into activities at the University of Chicago and Roosevelt College. We were in continual attendance at the hearings, we have studied the exhibits and affidavits submitted, and we hold that the findings of the majority in their press release were not in accord with the known facts and are not supported by evidence.

The State Commission was charged with investigating "subversive activities." None was found. No charges were substantiated that any faculty member was a Communist, or that there was "subversive teaching" at the University. On the record of the investigation the University was cleared. It is unfortunate that the Commission did not see fit to say just that. The harm done by the notoriety attending the investigation cannot be minimized. But the responsibility of legislative investigating committees is not the same as the responsibilities of universities in the pursuit of truth.

LYNN A. WILLIAMS, JR., *Vice-President*  
The University of Chicago



## FREEDOM AT HARVARD<sup>1</sup>

*An Exchange of Letters by Frank B. Ober, Baltimore, Md.,  
James B. Conant, President of Harvard University, and  
Grenville Clark, Fellow of Harvard College*

*Mr. Ober to President Conant*

Baltimore, Md.

April 26, 1949

Two recent incidents reflecting the apparent attitude of Harvard toward extra-curricular activities of professors giving aid and comfort to Communism have made me decide not to subscribe to the Harvard Law School Fund.

The first was an appeal made by one Professor Ciardi at a so-called "Progressive" rally for funds to fight laws directed at Communism proposed by a Maryland Commission of which I was Chairman—and which incidentally passed our General Assembly substantially as written, with but one dissenting vote. Copy of report is enclosed.

I concede the right of self-appointed "liberals" to fight particular laws against Communism, as there can be honest debate as to the method of handling the question.

But the so-called "Progressive" campaign against the laws enacted in Maryland was not debate, but vilification and falsehood—the usual Communist weapons. They attempted to foment hatred and prejudice in the typical Communist way by stating the proposed laws would send people to jail for activities intended to aid Negroes, Jews, Labor, Catholics, etc., etc. No one reading our report or the law could possibly so construe it with any semblance of honesty. Communists were actually using the Progressive Party, and the meeting Ciardi was reported to have attended was addressed by Marcantonio and other fellow travellers in the

<sup>1</sup> Reprinted through the courtesy of *The Harvard Alumni Bulletin*, June 25, 1949.

usual way—so he must have been aware of its nature. His own speech was not reported to any extent, and I do not know what he said, nor do I know whether he is a Communist, but I do know the meeting gained some respectability by the statement that a Harvard professor took part in it.

The other incident is, of course, the New York Peace meeting of which Professor Shapley was Chairman.

I do not believe a great university can properly permit the prestige which its name gives its professors to be used in a manner hostile to our own country. Anyone has a right to fight the Atlantic Alliance. Indeed, a good argument can be made against it on honestly debatable grounds. But to my mind it is quite a different matter to join in a propaganda effort with the agents of a foreign hostile power which is engaged in efforts to subvert this country by conspiratorial methods.

The vast majority of our people have gradually reached the conclusion that Communism is not a political movement—but is a criminal conspiracy. (See Md. Report, pp. 17–20.) Even the *Baltimore Sun*, with all its ultra “liberalism” and almost fanatic devotion to free speech, has recently reached this conclusion. Our national defense policy is directed at Communism and the time has arrived when we can no longer risk our national survival by applying a “double standard,” as *Life* recently said, to its conspiratorial agents in this country. The Smith Act of 1940 makes it criminal to advocate the violent overthrow of the government, and this is the law of the land. Yet, most thoughtful people who have examined Communist actions and documents know that is precisely what they are seeking to do. The laws just passed in this and some seventeen other states show an increasing awareness of this basic truth.

Surely, Harvard would not permit its professors to remain on the payrolls if they engage in conferences encouraging other types of conspiracies looking toward other crimes as part of their extra-curricular activity. Why then the distinction because the conspiracy is directed toward the forcible overthrow of our government—in short, sedition or peacetime “treason?” The test of a professor’s actions ought not to be whether he can be actually proved guilty of a crime. Reasonable grounds to doubt his loyalty

to our government should disqualify him, for the position is one of trust, and the government has, if it chooses to exercise it, regulatory power over education.

Anyone familiar with Communist methods knows that most of the damage from teachers is done outside of the classroom, made possible by the influence gained in the classroom. Similarly, I believe a professor's efforts to aid Communists gain greatly from his prestige as a professor, and it is not reasonable to close one's eyes to such extra-curricular activities.

As to academic freedom, I agree with Hook as against Meiklejohn in the recent *New York Times Magazine* debate, and think its limits are well stated in the Coudert Report (quoted p. 52 of Md. Report).

As to "tenure," I believe that:

(a) Every contract is subject to an implied obligation (if not expressly stated) to avoid aiding and abetting sedition or peacetime treason. The philosophy of our Commission was to give the colleges an opportunity to police themselves—rather than providing for governmental supervision, which might be greatly abused. The collegiate authorities already pass upon whether a man's teaching effectively covers a subject, and it would be no broader exercise of discretion to determine whether it is, on the whole, encouraging "treason" or not.

(b) Even if contracts are not subject to such an implied condition, at least future contracts, including any required by a raise in salary, should include appropriate conditions.

(c) I see no reason why the need of security of position in collegiate professorships to attract applicants to take such a position of trust is any greater than in government positions, where "reasonable grounds on all the evidence" to believe an employee is disloyal is a ground for discharge under the President's Executive Order.

In any event, I am adding my protest of what seems to me a very grave danger that the colleges are not alive to the nature or dangers arising from Communism. I know there are exceptions. I understand Dr. Bronk recently added the prestige of his presence to an anti-Communist lecture. I wonder if the group of students at Harvard organized to combat Communism received any official encouragement. I have not seen it stated in the press. Such a

group, if given proper stimulation and properly organized, might attain national influence by spreading the movement to all colleges, which would do much to combat Communism so prevalent there, but only if the authorities at the same time kept a closer watch on what its professors are doing.

FRANK B. OBER

*President Conant to Mr. Ober*

Cambridge, Mass.  
May 11, 1949

The attitude of Harvard toward the extracurricular activities of its professors is a policy of long standing. The fact that certain incidents have led you to refuse to subscribe to the Harvard Law School Fund does not surprise me. During the past forty years, to my personal knowledge, from time to time people have come to similar decisions because of their dislike of things Harvard professors have said publicly.

Nevertheless, we believe that our way of operating the University is not only in the best interests of Harvard but of importance to the entire country. On this point I think the case has never been better stated than by Mr. Lowell in his Annual Report of 1916-17, of which I am enclosing a copy. May I likewise take the liberty of referring you to my Annual Report for 1948, in which I set forth some of the basic premises of University operation.

Since your comments go to the heart of the nature of a university and have broad implications, I have asked Mr. Grenville Clark, a senior member of the Corporation and a leader in your profession, to write to you. I am sure you will be interested in his account of the history and significance of the traditional Harvard policy.

JAMES B. CONANT

*Mr. Lowell's Statement Concerning the Professor Outside the Classroom*

The gravest questions, and the strongest feelings, arise from action by a professor beyond his chosen field and outside of his classroom. Here he speaks only as a citizen. By appointment to a professorship he acquires no rights that he did not possess

before; but there is a real difference of opinion today on the question whether he loses any rights that he would otherwise enjoy. The argument in favor of a restraining power on the part of the governing boards of universities and colleges is based upon the fact that by extreme, or injudicious, remarks that shock public sentiment a professor can do great harm to the institution with which he is connected. That is true, and sometimes a professor thoughtlessly does an injury that is without justification. If he publishes an article on the futility and harmfulness of vaccination, and signs it as professor in a certain university, he leads the public to believe that his views are those of an authority on the subject, approved by the institution and taught to its students. If he is really a professor of Greek, he is misleading the public and misrepresenting his university, which he would not do if he gave his title in full.

In spite of the risk of injury to the institution, the objections to restraint upon what professors may say as citizens seems to me far greater than the harm done by leaving them free. In the first place, to impose upon the teacher in a university restrictions to which the members of other professions, lawyers, physicians, engineers, and so forth, are not subjected, would produce a sense of irritation and humiliation. In accepting a chair under such conditions a man would surrender a part of his liberty; what he might say would be submitted to the censorship of a board of trustees, and he would cease to be a free citizen. The lawyer, physician, or engineer may express his views as he likes on the subject of the protective tariff; shall the professor of astronomy not be free to do the same? Such a policy would tend seriously to discourage some of the best men from taking up the scholar's life. It is not a question of academic freedom, but of personal liberty from constraint, yet it touches the dignity of the academic career.

That is an objection to restraint on freedom of speech from the standpoint of the teacher. There is another, not less weighty, from that of the institution itself. If a university or college censors what its professors may say, if it restrains them from uttering something that it does not approve, it thereby assumes responsibility for that which it permits them to say. This is logical

and inevitable, but it is a responsibility which an institution of learning would be very unwise in assuming. It is sometimes suggested that the principles are different in time of war; that the governing boards are then justified in restraining unpatriotic expressions injurious to the country. But the same problem is presented in wartime as in time of peace. If the university is right in restraining its professors, it has a duty to do so, and it is responsible for whatever it permits. There is no middle ground. Either the university assumes full responsibility for permitting its professors to express certain opinions in public, or it assumes no responsibility whatever, and leaves them to be dealt with like other citizens by the public authorities according to the laws of the land. [From the Annual Report of Dr. A. Lawrence Lowell as President of Harvard University for 1916-17.]

*Mr. Clark to Mr. Ober*

Dublin, N. H.

May 27, 1949

Mr. Conant sent me your letter to him of April 26 and his reply of May 11. He suggested that I might care to write you regarding the "history and significance of the traditional Harvard policy" on freedom of expression for the faculties and students. I am willing to do this because I think your letter raises questions that go to the very life of Harvard and all other colleges and are, therefore, of vital consequence to the country at large. While I write at Mr. Conant's suggestion, I do so only as an individual—although I do believe that my convictions are held by the vast majority of Harvard men.

Let me say at once that your proposals—apparently to dismiss or censure two professors, and certainly to impose drastic controls on the activities as citizens of all professors—cannot and will not be adopted at Harvard, so long as Harvard remains true to her principles.

Those proposals are absolutely contrary to Harvard's tradition and all she stands for. By reviewing the history of freedom at Harvard under Mr. Eliot, Mr. Lowell, and Mr. Conant, I will try to make clear why this is so.



*I. Analysis of Your Complaint and Opinions.*

At the outset, I summarize your letter—I hope adequately and fairly.

You first state your intention not to subscribe to the Harvard Law School Fund because of the part taken by Professor Ciardi (Assistant Professor of English Composition), and by Professor Harlow Shapley, in two recent public meetings. It seems that you want them both disciplined. And then you go on with some general observations and recommendations for basic changes in Harvard policy in respect of the “extra-curricular activities” of all professors.

Concerning the two professors, your complaint as to Professor Ciardi relates to his speaking at a Progressive Party meeting in Maryland called in opposition to certain bills “directed at Communism” proposed by a Commission of which you were Chairman. You say: “But the so-called ‘Progressive’ campaign against the laws enacted in Maryland was not debate, but vilification and falsehood—the usual Communist weapons,” and “they attempted to foment hatred and prejudice in the typical Communist way. . . .” As to what Professor Ciardi said at the meeting, you say: “His own speech was not reported to any extent and I do not know what he said. . . .” So you do not complain of anything he said; nor do you question his motives. But you indicate that he ought not to have addressed that meeting at all because “Communists were actually using the Progressive Party, and the meeting Ciardi was reported to have attended was addressed by Marcantonio and other fellow travellers in the usual way—so he must have been aware of its nature.” You add that “the meeting gained some respectability by the statement that a Harvard professor took part in it.”

It seems, therefore, that the essence of what you complain of on this count lies in the mere fact of Professor Ciardi’s having spoken at that particular meeting, without regard to his purpose or any utterance of his.

Your other specific complaint—about Professor Shapley—concerns his part in the recent Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace in New York. You do not elaborate on that and

do not complain of anything he said, nor do you criticize his motives. So it seems that here, too, the offense, in your eyes, is the mere fact of his having presided at that meeting, and his part in its organization, as distinguished from anything said by him or any unworthy motive.

Both the Maryland and New York meetings were on public issues and were open to the press. You do not question the complete legality of either meeting. And yet you seem to say that the two professors committed some sort of grave offense. You seem to base this idea upon the following line of thought: "Communism is not a political movement—but is a criminal conspiracy"; hence if Communists or "fellow travellers" have any material part in a particular meeting, that meeting, although entirely legal and open, is a part of a criminal conspiracy; and hence all persons, including these professors, who engaged actively in such meetings, whatever the purpose of the meetings or the motives of the participants or what they said, are involved in a criminal conspiracy.

On this basis, you appear to recommend, although your letter is not absolutely explicit on this point, that these two professors should somehow be disciplined—presumably by dismissal or at least by rebuke.

It is at first hard to believe that you intend to go to such lengths. But on re-reading your letter again and again, one is forced to this conclusion. For you seem directly to identify engaging in such public meetings with "other types of conspiracies looking towards other crimes as part of their extra-curricular activity" (I suppose, for example, arson or robbery); and ask: "Why then the distinction because the conspiracy is directed toward the forcible overthrow of our government—in short, sedition or peacetime 'treason'?"

I do not see how you can expect reasonable men to think of participation in open and legal meetings on public subjects as the equivalent of secret plotting to commit crime, merely because Communists or "fellow travellers" take part in such meetings. On this line of reasoning, literally thousands of reputable citizens would have offended. By no possibility could Harvard adopt a view which, to put it mildly, is so extreme. To do so would, I believe, call for conclusions which offend common sense and for

efforts at repression that would be out of place anywhere in our country and are inconceivable at Harvard.

Concerning your broader proposals for control of the outside activities of all professors, you want all the present agreements for their services so construed and future agreements so drafted that "aiding and abetting sedition or peacetime treason" shall be cause for discipline. Thus you say that in "future contracts, including any required by a raise in salary" there should be "appropriate conditions" on this subject. You also mention that: "Reasonable grounds to doubt his (a professor's) loyalty to our government should disqualify him..." and "see no reason" why professors should be treated any differently in this regard than government employees where "'reasonable grounds on all the evidence' to believe an employee is disloyal is a ground for discharge under the President's Executive Order."

From the context it is clear that you would like to have the "appropriate conditions" cover all matters that might in your view furnish the above "reasonable grounds"—including, no doubt, involvement in any meeting materially influenced by Communists or "fellow travellers" and, I suppose, a good many other things. And you evidently want violation of any "appropriate" conditions cause for dismissal or discipline.

In addition you want the authorities to keep a "closer watch on what its professors are doing." On this point you evidently want a watch kept pretty much all the time—presumably day and night, in term and in vacation. For you say that "most of the damage from teachers is done outside of the classroom" and that "it is not reasonable to close one's eyes to such extra-curricular activities."

As to the students, you want the Harvard governing authorities to give "official encouragement" to students who organize to oppose Communism.

I hope you will agree that this is a fair summary and interpretation of your complaint and recommendations.

## *II. Harvard Convictions and Tradition Utterly Opposed to Your Program: History and Significance of the Tradition.*

I repeat that the things you ask for will not and cannot be done

at Harvard—at least as long as Harvard retains its basic principles and holds by its tradition. And if the day ever came that such things were done at the physical place on which the Harvard buildings stand or anywhere by the Harvard authorities, it would not be “Harvard” doing them; it would be an institution of an entirely different sort, with wholly different ideas and purposes.

The fundamental reason is that for Harvard to take the course you recommend would be to repudiate the very essence of what Harvard stands for—the search for truth by a free and uncoerced body of students and teachers. And it would be to make a mockery of a long tradition of Harvard freedom for both its students and its faculties.

As to the history of that tradition, while it is much more than eighty years old, it is sufficient, I think, to go back to President Charles W. Eliot’s inaugural address in 1869 and follow down from there.

Mr. Eliot then said: “A university must be indigenous; it must be rich; but, above all, it must be free. The winnowing breeze of freedom must blow through all its chambers. . . . This University aspires to serve the nation by training men to intellectual honesty and independence of mind. The corporation demands of all its teachers that they be grave, reverent, and high-minded; but it leaves them, like their pupils, free.”

The tradition so expressed was well understood and applied under President Eliot. It was then carried on and emphasized during the more controversial term of President A. Lawrence Lowell from 1909 to 1933.

In his report for 1916–17 (from which Mr. Conant sent you an extract) Mr. Lowell took notice that the war had “brought to the front” questions of academic freedom, especially “liberty of speech on the part of the professor.” He then went on to make so discriminating an analysis of the subject that in the opinion of many, including myself, the writing of those few pages was the most lasting public service of his long career.

As applied to the “extra-curricular” activities that you stress, the essence of the report is that “beyond his chosen field and outside of his classroom” the professor “speaks only as a citizen”; that his professorship gives him no rights that he did not possess

before; but, on the other hand, it is unwise to restrict those rights because "the objections to restraint upon what professors may say as citizens seem to me far greater than the harm done by leaving them free." Mr. Lowell declared that by accepting a chair under restrictive conditions, the professor "would cease to be a free citizen" and that "such a policy would tend seriously to discourage some of the best men from taking up the scholar's life." "It is not," he emphasized, "a question of academic freedom, but of personal liberty from constraint. . . ." Beyond that, he made a point very applicable to what you propose, *i. e.*, that: "If a university or college censors what its professors may say, if it restrains them from uttering something that it does not approve, it thereby assumes responsibility for that which it permits them to say. . . . There is no middle ground." And, therefore, he concluded, the University, assuming the sincerity of the professor's utterances on public matters, should take "no responsibility whatever" but should leave "them to be dealt with like other citizens by the public authorities according to the laws of the land."

I have tried to state only the essence of Mr. Lowell's thought as applied to your letter. Doubtless you are familiar with his report and I can only commend a restudy of its closely reasoned pages. The point is that this report, which became famous, stands today as part of the Harvard tradition of freedom of expression, and as a definite guide for Harvard policy.

Coming now to President Conant's term, we find the same basic thought expressed with equal clarity and force. In his address at the Harvard Tercentenary Celebration in 1936, he said:

"We must have a spirit of tolerance which allows the expression of all opinions however heretical they may appear. . . . Unfortunately there are ominous signs that a new form of bigotry may arise. This is most serious, for we cannot develop the unifying educational forces we so sorely need unless all matters may be openly discussed. . . . On this point there can be no compromise; we are either afraid of heresy or we are not."

These declarations of three Harvard presidents are, as you observe, all of a piece. They embody a consistent doctrine that can, I think, be summed up as follows:

(1) Harvard believes in the "free trade in ideas" of Justice Holmes—a graduate of 1861—which is no more than saying that she believes in the principles of Milton's *Areopagitica* (1644), of Jefferson's First Inaugural (1801), and of Mill's "Essay on Liberty" (1859). She thinks that repression is not wise or workable under our system, that wide latitude for conflicting views affords the best chance for good government, and that in suppression usually lies the greater peril. Harvard is not afraid of freedom, and believes adherence to this principle to be fundamental for our universities and for the integrity of our institutions.

(2) She believes that the members of the faculties, in their capacity as citizens, have the same rights to express themselves as other citizens and that those rights should not be restricted by the University by trying to keep a "watch" on professors or otherwise.

(3) She believes that wide limits for free expression by professors are in the interest of her students as well as the teachers. The teachers have rights as citizens to speak and write as men of independence; the students also have their rights to be taught by men of independent mind.

(4) Harvard, like any great privately supported university, badly needs money; but Harvard will accept no gift on the condition, expressed or implied, that it shall compromise its tradition of freedom.

These beliefs are not a matter of lip service. They have been applied in practice at Harvard for a long time. Thus, there certainly prevailed at Harvard during the forty years of Mr. Eliot's term an atmosphere highly favorable to free expression by both students and teachers. I know that when I was at Cambridge 1899-1906, one felt it in the very air that neither the students nor professors were under constraint. The absence of restriction on free expression by faculty and students at that time, and during the early years of Mr. Lowell's term, was implicit rather than something needing constant assertion; but it was nonetheless real.

In later years of the Lowell administration, however, in what has been called the period of "uneasy fears"—much like the present—during and after the first World War, cases arose which provided an acid test for the Harvard doctrine.

The two best-known incidents were those of Professor Zechariah Chafee, Jr., and of Harold J. Laski. They are related in Professor Yeomans' recent life of Mr. Lowell.

In the former case, Professor Chafee wrote an article condemning



the conduct of the trial judge in the famous Abrams sedition case. This was in 1920 at the height of the postwar alarm about sedition and Bolshevism. It was the period of Attorney General Palmer's "raids," and of the expulsion of duly elected Socialist members from the New York Legislature, in the face of powerful opposition led by Charles E. Hughes. Some Harvard men in New York accused Professor Chafee of inaccuracies in his article and, without specifying exactly what should be done, asked the Overseers to take notice of his conduct. The Overseers' Committee to Visit the Law School took up the matter and there occurred what was known as "The Trial at the Harvard Club." Mr. Lowell appeared and in effect acted as counsel for Professor Chafee. He took an unequivocal position in defense of the professor's right to espouse an unpopular cause, and the net result was a dismissal or dropping of the complaint. That case remains a landmark in Harvard's course.

In the Laski case, Mr. Laski, then a young lecturer at Harvard, spoke up for the side of the police strikers in Boston in 1919. Feeling on that issue was terrific; emotion ran high against anyone taking the strikers' side and there were insistent demands for the dismissal of Mr. Laski. Nevertheless, Mr. Lowell stood firmly for Mr. Laski's right to speak his mind; there was no dismissal and that set another great precedent.

Since then there have been various other incidents in which the principle has been vindicated. Perhaps the very latest was the permission given a month ago to the Harvard Law School Forum to have Mr. Laski (now, thirty years later, Professor Laski of the University of London) speak in Sanders Theater. Because of the Cambridge School Board's objections to Mr. Laski, the Forum had been denied the use of a public school auditorium where its meetings had customarily been held. The Forum then asked for the use of Sanders Theater and, in accordance with established practice on student meetings, the request was granted.

It is, I think, unnecessary to go into more detail. For it is well established and known that Harvard has a long-declared and, on the whole, well-adhered-to tradition favoring a wide degree of freedom for teacher and student and, therefore, as you must perceive, a tradition utterly at variance with what you recommend.

Mr. Conant mentioned the "significance" as well as the "history" of the tradition.

To my mind, its fundamental significance lies in the thought that the principles back of it are essential to the American Idea—to the workability of our free institutions and to enabling Americans to live satisfactory lives.

The professor's right to speak his mind and to espouse unpopular causes should not be regarded as something separate and apart from the maintenance of our civil rights in general. I think what is usually called academic freedom is simply part and parcel of American freedom—merely a segment of the whole front.

I believe, however, that it is an especially vital segment because it concerns the students quite as much as the professors. If the professors are censored, constrained, or harassed, it affects not only themselves; it affects also those whom they teach—the future voters and leaders upon whose integrity and independence of mind will depend the institutions by which we live and breathe a free air. For if the professors have always to conform and avoid unpopular views whether in class or out, what kind of men will they be? And where will our young men and women go to hear and weigh new ideas, to consider both sides and acquire balance and integrity?

In *The Wild Flag* the essayist E. B. White has defined democracy in a way closely touching this point. "Democracy," he said, "is the recurrent suspicion that more than half of the people are right more than half of the time." This is about it, is it not—the very basis of our system? But how can we possibly expect most of the people to be right most of the time if they are taught by men and women of a sort who are constrained to work under conditions where they may lose their jobs if, pursuant to conviction, they attend meetings that some, or even the majority of the moment, do not approve?

In that inaugural address of Mr. Eliot's, it is also said: "In the modern world the intelligence of public opinion is the one indispensable condition of social progress." And further: "The student should be made acquainted with all sides of these (philosophical and political) controversies, with the salient points of each system. . . . The notion that education consists in the authorita-

tive inculcation of what the teacher deems true may be logical and appropriate in a convent, or a seminary for priests, but it is intolerable in universities and public schools, from primary to professional."

But how can we fulfill the "indispensable condition" of intelligent opinion; and how can we have nondogmatic and excellent instruction for our leaders if their teachers are coerced or harassed?

It is impossible; and since I believe that the very existence of our free institutions depends on the independence and integrity of our teachers, the main significance for me of the Harvard tradition is that it powerfully helps to sustain those institutions.

No doubt there are other more specialized significances. No doubt the Harvard tradition has significance because, if abandoned, it would make many good people, members of our faculties, very unhappy. No doubt it is significant because its abandonment would force others—administrators and Governing Boards—either to resign or, against conscience, to engage in work bitterly hateful to them. These things are true and important. But it is enough for me that the tradition is in harmony with and necessary to the maintenance of the free institutions of America, and to the values that make life in our country most worth while.

### *III. Practical Implications.*

I cannot help wondering whether you have thought through the implications of what you propose.

Since you wish to discipline professors for taking active part in meetings such as those at which Professors Ciardi and Shapley spoke, would it not be fair to pass in advance on the kind of meetings professors could safely attend? Would this not call for a University licensing board? And would not such a board have an obnoxious and virtually impossible task?

The very cases you mention illustrate this. The Maryland meeting was called by the Maryland branch of the official Progressive Party (the Wallace party) which is a legal organization for whose ticket over a million citizens voted in 1948. The New York meeting was to advocate peace and was sponsored by many reputable citizens whose motives were above question.

If the University should undertake to decide whether or not a professor, in his capacity as a citizen, could take part in these or other meetings, what Mr. Lowell referred to would necessarily occur. If attendance at the meeting were disapproved, the professor would be deprived, under penalty of discipline, of a right enjoyed by other citizens; while if approved, the University would assume the responsibility for endorsing the meeting.

Moreover, I think you will agree that there would be little sense in censoring attendance at meetings and leaving free from censorship speeches on the radio or writings in the press, magazines, pamphlets, and books. Would not your proposals call for a censorship of all these?

Take, for example, the recent book, *Military and Political Consequences of Atomic Energy*, by Professor Blackett of Manchester University. That is a highly controversial book because it sought to justify the Soviet position on atomic energy control. I have not heard that Professor Blackett's loyalty to Britain has been questioned. But suppose that book to have been written by a Harvard professor, is it not probable that in our more tense and excited atmosphere someone would charge that it raised "reasonable doubts" about his loyalty? I think it would have been quite certain that such a charge would have been forthcoming. And, if so, would it not be fair to the professor, and also necessary to make your proposals effective, that such a book be submitted for censorship before its publication?

Beyond that, however, how could an effective "closer watch" on "extra-curricular activities" be maintained unless the watch extended to conversations and correspondence? And how could that be done without a system of student and other informers—the classic and necessary method of watching for "subversive" utterances?

You may not have realized the full implications of what you ask. But if you will stop to consider what would necessarily be involved if your point of view were accepted, you must agree, I think, that these things are precisely what would be required.

What I have just said applies to the professors. But how about the students? Would it be sensible to have the teachers censored and watched while the students remain at liberty freely

to speak and write and to attend such meetings as they choose, subject only to the laws of the land? On your philosophy are you not driven on to restrict, censor, and discipline the students also?

What sort of a place would Harvard be if it went down this road? It would, I think, not require six months to destroy the morale of both our teachers and students, and thereby our usefulness to the country. I think one need do no more than state the necessary implications of what you ask to demonstrate that nothing could be more alien to the principle of free expression that Harvard stands for.

#### *IV. Harvard Money and Harvard Freedom.*

I want to add a comment on your decision not to subscribe to the Law School Fund. As Mr. Conant wrote you, it has happened before that subscriptions have been withheld because of objections to the acts or opinions of professors or because of disapproval of University policy. This is natural and normal, I think; and it is certainly the right of anyone not to aid an institution with which he is as out of harmony as you now seem to be with Harvard. But it is also true, I am sure you will agree, that Harvard cannot be influenced at all to depart from her basic tradition of freedom by any fear that gifts will be withheld.

An interesting test case on this point came up during the first World War. It related to Professor Hugo Münsterberg, who was a German and very pro-German, and is described in Professor Yeomans' biography of President Lowell. It appears that the press reported that a certain Harvard man had, in Professor Yeomans' words, "threatened to annul a bequest to the University of \$10,000,000 unless Münsterberg was immediately deprived of his professorship." Thereupon Professor Münsterberg wrote to the Harvard Corporation offering to resign if the graduate would immediately remit \$5,000,000 to the Corporation. The Professor's letter was returned and the Corporation issued, as Professor Yeomans puts it, "one of its rare public pronouncements," as follows: "It is now officially stated that, at the instance of the authorities, Professor Münsterberg's resignation has been withdrawn, and that the University cannot tolerate any suggestion

that it would be willing to accept money to abridge free speech, to remove a professor, or to accept his resignation."

I think it will always be Harvard policy not to be influenced in any way "to abridge free speech" by the withholding of any subscription. And if \$5,000,000 or any sum were offered tomorrow as the price of the removal of Professor Ciardi or Professor Shapley, or of instituting the "closer watch" that you recommend, nothing is more certain than that the Corporation would again reply that it "cannot tolerate" the suggestion.

On this money matter, the practical question has always interested me as to whether Harvard's adherence to this principle has in fact been to her financial detriment. Certainly one can point to some specific cases, besides your own, where gifts have not been made because the possible donors thought Harvard should have disciplined professors or students for their supposed "sedition" or "radicalism." I well remember how much was said on the score during the early days of the New Deal as relating to the activities, actual or supposed, of Professor Felix Frankfurter. So I do not doubt that some gifts have been withheld for reasons of this sort. On the other hand, less is heard, usually nothing at all, of those others who, instead of being repelled by the steadiness of Harvard's adherence to free expression, find in it the true glory of Harvard and a principal reason for supporting her finances.

Thus I am quite sure that there are many Harvard men and others who, if they read your letter and were told that Harvard must firmly decline to follow your views, would find in that very refusal a strong reason for adding to their gifts. I think that many such would say: "If Harvard is again under pressure to depart from its tradition but is holding to it as solidly as ever, that is the place on which I want to put my money, because if we want to preserve the essence of the American Idea we must encourage those who adhere consistently to uncoerced teaching."

So I just don't know, and no one can know, whether, *on balance*, Harvard gains or loses money by its policy in this regard. But, although it cannot be proved, I have a shrewd suspicion that, while Harvard may for a few years, in times of emotion like the present, lose some gifts and bequests by its adherence to free



expression, it loses no money at all over a generation by holding to this principle.

In any case, while that is an intriguing question, it is not the real one. For whether the policy gains money or loses it, Harvard, in order to *be* Harvard, has to hew to the line. That is what Mr. Eliot meant, I am sure, when he said, in 1869, that while a university "must be rich" it must "above all" be free. That choice is as clear today as eighty years ago.

I am under no illusion that this letter, or any similar argument, is likely to affect your attitude in this matter, at least for some time. For my observation in the corresponding period after the first World War was that in a period of alarm, proposals to restrict free expression rest on strong feelings which for the time being override sound judgment. That was certainly true of the above-mentioned successful effort to oust the Socialist Assemblymen in New York, and the unsuccessful effort to discipline Professor Chafee. Several years later, I think that some of those who promoted those efforts came to see that they had been impairing the very values which, no doubt sincerely, they purported to preserve. But during the period of stress, they found it hard even to comprehend the other side.

I hope, though, that I may have convinced you that there is another side, and that there is a deep-rooted tradition at Harvard utterly opposed to your view—a tradition that must and will be upheld as long as Harvard remains true to herself.

GRENVILLE CLARK

*Mr. Ober to Mr. Clark*

Baltimore, Md.

June 8, 1949

I have read with considerable surprise your letter, which misconstrues mine of April 26 to Mr. Conant, and completely disregards the Maryland Commission report enclosed therein, explaining my views and recommendations with respect to meeting the Communist problem in schools and colleges. Had you read the report carefully you could scarcely call your letter "a fair summary" of my views. That report recommended and explained

a statute requiring and providing means for investigating the loyalty of prospective teachers in State institutions, and for discharging those already employed only if, *after notice and hearing*, it is found there are "reasonable grounds on all the evidence" to believe a teacher disloyal, thus adopting a procedure similar to the President's Loyalty Order now governing millions of Federal employees.

As you know, my letter was not written for publication, and the brief space allowed me for reply to your lengthy letter does not permit me to explain my views in detail, or to specifically refer to and answer many statements and inferences as to my position, which are unjustified.

I believe that colleges have a duty to the Nation, and to their students and alumni, to take *practical* steps to see that Communists and other disloyal teachers are eliminated from the faculties. The problem is a difficult one, and there is difference of opinion as to the best means of handling it fairly and adequately, but I believe a program similar to the Federal program offers the best solution. This assumes: that academic freedom does not justify employing originally, or retaining in employment, disloyal teachers; that colleges have continuing responsibility to investigate loyalty (including motives and purposes) when they receive credible evidence that their professors are aiding Communism; and that this is justified not only on the ground of national security, but also by the fact that teachers hold a position of trust and most Americans do not want their children educated or influenced by disloyal teachers. The Federal program is not extreme; nor does it involve your implications of censorship, coercion, and continuous watching. It will *usually* prevent teachers from abusing the prestige of their position by aiding and abetting Communism, but not *always*, because the *only* procedure suggested contemplates discharge if found *disloyal after* notice and hearing.

The substitution of "reasonable grounds on all the evidence" as a criterion of loyalty for the criminal test of "proof beyond a reasonable doubt" seems required by the nature of the problem and the practical difficulties of an employer sustaining such a burden. It should not depend upon proof of crime; nor should the technical legality of meetings or organizations be conclusive as a

defense. The Communist Party itself is legal in many states and constantly operates through legal "fronts."

The basic difference between us is that your essay on academic freedom completely fails to distinguish Socialism, or other unpopular radical issues, from Communism, which to most Americans means providing the fifth column for a foreign power plotting our destruction. Academic freedom, under your interpretation, would apparently permit a Harvard professor to advocate and to aid and abet Communism, in the same manner you would permit him to advocate any other cause. Your position must be due to your failure to recognize the implications of Communism and that one of the primary objects of the fifth column in the present cold war is infiltration of colleges, so that Communists can be close to scientific developments, corrupt the next generation, and, incidentally, give prestige to front organizations. You would hardly say, if *reasonable grounds on all the evidence* indicates a professor is incompetent, or publicly leads a scandalous life—though not violating laws—he should be protected by academic freedom. Communism is not a lesser evil, and threatens national security. Your letter gave no assurances whatsoever that *you* are concerned about Communist teachers.

Mr. Conant's joinder in a splendid public statement on Communist teachers today gives the reassurance I was seeking—that Harvard *is* alive to that menace. *Appropriate steps to implement that policy are now in order.* I sincerely hope that the principle of our statute, taken from the Federal loyalty program, may contribute to the solution of this exceedingly difficult problem.

FRANK B. OBER

*Mr. Clark to Mr. Ober*

Dublin, N. H.  
June 11, 1949

The Editor confines me, quite properly, to 300 words. So I reply almost telegraphically.

Did I misconstrue your first letter? The reader can judge by carefully comparing it with my summary. I did not disregard

the Maryland report. I stand upon my analysis as accurate and fair. The reader must decide.

You mention Mr. Conant's joinder in a recent report, one point of which is that a Communist Party Member is disqualified to teach. But you want to reach far beyond Communists. You want to discipline any teacher if, after hearing, "reasonable grounds on all the evidence" are found to doubt his "loyalty." These are slippery terms.

I affirm again that your plan implies an extensive system of detection and trial. Nothing of this character will happen under Mr. Conant. There will be no harassment of professors for engaging in open and legal meetings. There will be no apparatus of inquiry and "closer watch." The harm done by the effort necessary to discover even a single clandestine Party Member would outweigh any possible benefit. To go beyond that by searching for "reasonable grounds" concerning "loyalty," would still more disrupt Harvard or any free university. No greater mistake could be made than to suppose that because a proved Party Member, bound by Party discipline, should not teach, all professors are to be policed or watched. I know these to be Mr. Conant's firm convictions.

Your sincerity is unquestioned. But that very fact is disturbing. The framers of the Sedition Act of 1798 had conviction. Those who led in ousting the Socialist Assemblymen were also sincere. So, while I believe you misguided, I do not question your motives.

These issues run deep. Their ventilation is healthy. Therefore, I hope that this correspondence—all of it—will be read and pondered.

GRENVILLE CLARK

## THE STRANGLEHOLD ON EDUCATION

By HAROLD L. CLAPP

Grinnell College

As a parent, I want to have my sons educated by teachers who themselves are broadly educated and kindled with the love of learning. As an observer of teacher training and selection, I see little likelihood that they will be so trained. Conscientious local school authorities select the best candidates they can afford among available licensed teachers, and sometimes they are lucky. The fact remains that each year thousands of poorly trained, fourth-rate teachers are licensed and find positions. The law of averages and the professional educational theorists are against us.

Some years ago, in some way or other, these theorists sold to an unsuspecting public and a drowsy academic world a strange bill of goods: the notion that there is a special branch of learning, a *science*, called "Education." With a capital *E*. Not what Webster calls "the impartation or acquisition of knowledge, skill, or development," or "the sum of qualities acquired through individual instruction and social training." "Education" for the Educationist is not a process or a result, but a *subject to be studied*, and it deals with motivation and norms, with optimum lighting conditions and child-centered programs, with pseudo-scientific shibboleth and esoteric connotation. To date, the only authority for this notion that I have run across is in the reiteration of the Educationists themselves. Apparently, "The proof is complete, if only they've stated it thrice."

How this science operates, and the sort of thing it accomplishes, could be variously illustrated. I choose, almost at random, a bulletin recently issued by a large state university. There, over a period of twenty-four years, Educationists studied the serious problem of how to judge effective teaching. Down through those years, the instructors of one particular course were carefully scrutinized. "Objective evidence of the effectiveness of the teachers"

was sought. The clerical labor involved was obviously enormous. No less weighty is the amount of pseudo-scientific vocabulary brought to bear. The report of this "Study" is in sixty-one pages, complete with fifty-three statistical tables and numerous formulas. Now offhand, you may not see what formulas have to do with recognizing good teachers, so I quote:

A final ranking of teachers on the basis of per cent efficiency was arrived at by assigning double values to the mean per cent efficiency and single values to the sigma and  $r$  per cents of efficiency. This final ranking of teachers, correlated with the 2-2-1 summation, yielded a Rho of  $0.8875 \pm 0.025$ . This shows about an 89% agreement between the two methods of ranking teachers.

So now you know how to tell whether Johnny's fourth grade teacher is doing a satisfactory job. On second thought, you will probably prefer to ask Johnny, prejudiced though he may be.

That formula is an admirable illustration of one of the essential traits of "Education": its dehumanizing mania for "objectivity," for "experimental evidence," for "testing," and all the concomitant jargon. Closely related is its serious concern for proving the obvious. At one time or another, with bated breath and rhetorical flourish, every platitude in the field of pedagogy has been the subject of weighty deliberation. It has been supported by argument and "proved" by "experimental" evidence. Witness the conclusion of the "Study" just quoted, wherein, after a quarter century of computing and tabulating, the author submits:

To sum up, the efficiency of the instructors is shown by the end product, the achievement of their students. "By their fruits ye shall know them" is impressively true about the teachers examined in this study.

Perhaps Johnny in the fourth grade could not tell you that at the moment, but I would wager a considerable sum that it would not take him until 1973 to figure it out, even without benefit of Rho or a 2-2-1 summation.



## II

Unfortunately, "Education" is not just the private eccentricity of a small group of college professors. *It is the force which controls public education.* The Educationist sets the standards of American education by establishing the requirements of teacher training. Since these requirements are largely in terms of the courses taught by the Educationists themselves, this approaches the definition of a racket. Thus, any improvement in educational standards must be accomplished through the Educationist, or over his dead body.

My first contention is that to date he has shown himself concerned not with improving standards, but with maintaining and strengthening a set of meaningless, mechanical requirements, which are in no sense a measure of teaching ability or general fitness for the profession.

In order to receive a license to teach, the college student must pass a certain number of "professional" courses. What these courses are like, I shall discuss a bit farther along. For the moment, notice merely that licensing boards do not ask the candidate what these courses are like, nor what he has learned, nor how well he has learned it. They do not inquire: "How well are you fitted to teach?" They only ask: "Have you passed such and such courses in 'Education'?"

One of these courses is generally a study of the "Methods" of teaching this or that subject. Sometimes this is entrusted to the staff which teaches the subject in question. I have taught such a special "Methods" course in three reputable institutions. State educational authorities have never expressed any interest in whether I taught it well or badly. Unanimously and without question, they have accepted as a teacher any student who squeezed through my course with the minimum passing grade, provided he squeezed through enough other courses. Just as unanimously, they refuse to allow *me* to teach in public schools. A sudden and specialized concern over my teaching ability? Of course not. It is just another example of the same mechanical, blind policy of "professional requirements." It happens that back in my own college days I never *studied* the "Methods" course which I have

since had occasion to teach repeatedly. On the one hand, without any evidence, it is assumed that I am a good teacher. On the other, just as arbitrarily, it is taken for granted that I am incompetent.

Lest that instance of meaningless rigidity be discounted as sour grapes, I hasten on to a proposal to introduce the study of Russian into the New York City schools. It has been described thus:

Board [of Education] rules state that only those shall be qualified to teach a language who have had courses in the methods of teaching that language. But no courses in the methods of teaching Russian are offered anywhere, because Russian has not yet become a high-school subject. This automatically disqualifies all the able, willing, and enthusiastic teachers of Russian and creates an ideal vicious circle: no methods courses, therefore no licenses, hence no teachers, hence no Russian in the high schools, hence no methods-of-teaching-Russian courses, etc.<sup>1</sup>

Consider also the generally enforced requirement in "observation and practice teaching." I have known students who fulfilled this requirement in French in a school which had no French teacher for them to observe or by whom to be guided; the case of the student who "practices" a subject he never expects to teach, because his own subject is not offered in the school where he practices, is not uncommon.

Unlike "Methods," "Practice Teaching" is a course for which I *did* receive credit when I went through the mill. Off and on that year I used up good college hours, traipsing around the county, dropping in unheralded on classes in various kinds of schools. Following these junkets, my conscience alone determined the number of hours for which I claimed credit. At the end of the year, my grade in that "course" (sic!) in "directed observation and supervised practice teaching" was determined in conversation with the professor, when I happened to meet him one day at the coffee shop. And as far as that particular requirement is concerned, I have ever since been qualified to teach in any public school in any state.

<sup>1</sup> Mario A. Pei, "A Modern Language Teacher Replies," Autumn, 1945, *Bulletin of American Association of University Professors*, Vol. XXXI, No. 3, p. 417.

Now, suppose on the other hand that John Wouldbe Pedagogue, a brilliant, conscientious, "born" leader and teacher, comes out of a superior college with the best education that his professors have known how to give him. He is filled with an enthusiastic desire to serve society by moulding young minds and characters. Perhaps by oversight, the hypothetical state in which he lives has no rigid "practice teaching" requirement. In his first position, he works under capable supervision, he gets his feet under him, he becomes a genuine inspiration to his students, and under his guidance they learn much that is fine and wise and useful.

Ten years later, because of his wife's health, he finds it imperative to move to a different state. There, of course, he is officially incompetent. He will have to change his occupation or go back to school, because as a student he did not go through the rite of "practice teaching." And if you think that ten years of successful experience will earn him a dispensation, you just don't know how unyielding are these alleged "standards" of certification.

Those, then, are some of the reasons for submitting that Educationists are concerned with purely mechanical requirements rather than teaching ability and the education of my children.

### III

My second contention is that these theorists are exclusively interested in the mere quantity, rather than the quality of teacher-training. Individually, professors of "Education" may recommend the very good student more highly than the very poor one. Professionally and collectively, however, they have established the same license for both. It is a grotesque caricature of democracy which allows the below-average student of one generation to impart knowledge to the next generation. Nevertheless, the "requirements" invoked make no distinction between the dullard whose compassionate instructors let him get by with a grade of sixty and his classmates who make Phi Beta Kappa. To be sure, intelligence and knowledge are not the only factors in successful teaching, but Educationists notwithstanding, they are still factors to be considered.

In other countries, teacher's licenses are granted on the basis of competitive examinations. Top students from our best law

schools must still pass bar examinations, and the best graduates from our best medical schools must still pass state medical examinations, before having the legal right to practice their professions. At the same time, the laziest, most stupid graduate of Freshwater Municipal College is certified for teaching on the strength of the number of courses he has passed. Such is the importance which we attach to educational standards in the United States.

The "science of Education," then, does nothing to raise these standards, but that is still the brightest side of the picture. My third contention is that this "science" actually operates to the *advantage* of poor teachers and inferior education, and actively *discourages* good teachers and high standards of instruction.

On occasion, it does so by frontal attack. Some time ago there came from the press of a large state university (but not the one where effective teaching was studied) a bulletin, entitled "The Combinations of Subjects of Specialization for High-School Teachers of Foreign Languages." (This means: what to study in college, if you plan to teach foreign languages.) Reduced to a few words, the message of the bulletin is this: "If you really want to teach French or Spanish, specialize while in college in *something else*—English, for example—for which there is a pretty good market, and study a little Spanish or French *on the side*." The theory seems to be that inferior training is adequate for any teacher whose subject is not studied by every student. By this logic, teacher-training programs would be determined by enrollment statistics, with no concern for the difficulty, nature, or importance of a field of study, and only in the most popular subjects would my children have the right to expect adequate instruction. By the same logic, the portrait painter should have less training than the house painter who, after all, spreads more paint in a given day; the pilot who is to take off and land only a mile away should receive exactly one per cent of the flight instruction given the pilot who is to fly a hundred miles.

Thus openly, and at state expense, Educationists are advocating poor teaching standards. Perhaps this is unconscious rather than cynical. At best, it is evidence of alarmingly fuzzy thinking.

More often, "Education" interferes with real education in ways less direct. For one thing, no dyed-in-the-wool Educationist

really seems to believe that knowledge of a subject has much to do with teaching that subject. Subject-matter requirements for teachers are pitifully inadequate, and cannot well be otherwise. There is much too little time to study the *subject* one is to teach when so much time is taken up by courses in *how* to teach, and so, all too often, a makeshift program of college courses is built around the required "professional" courses. Moreover, most certifying boards, composed of or influenced by Educationists, demand that subject-matter study be divided among two or three fields. They feel, apparently, that it is safer to have teachers poorly trained to teach two or three unrelated things than to have them well trained to teach one thing.

Consequently, the appalling fact is that *our most poorly educated college graduates are our teachers*.<sup>1</sup> A college which would raise its academic standards is invariably hindered by the plight of the prospective teacher, who because of "professional" requirements cannot carry more than a minimum of academic work. There are reputable colleges in the United States which have established the requirements for their A.B. degree at a high level, but which make a specific exception of the teacher-in-training. While they phrase it less baldly, their catalogues state in effect: "If you are going to be *educated* while in college, you must do this, and this, and this. If you are going to *teach instead*, less is expected of you." If that is the case in substantial colleges of liberal arts, it is not difficult (nor pleasant) to guess what the situation is in the so-called "teachers colleges" which, as the Harvard report on "General Education in a Free Society" puts it, "have taught everthing except the indispensable thing, the love of knowledge."

#### IV

American colleges themselves have a grave burden of responsibility in this. At a minimum they should say to tomorrow's teacher: "We believe that you must be at least as well educated as a grocer or a housewife. You must therefore fulfill our normal requirements for a degree. In addition to this, we offer you, as

<sup>1</sup> In this connection, see also Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Bulletin No. 29, New York, 1938.

a public service and of course without academic credit, whatever 'Education' courses you need. This will probably necessitate a fifth year in college." Unfortunately, few colleges have been able to afford these high principles in recent years. Instead, they have compromised with graduation requirements for teachers. They have granted full academic credit for the inferior courses in "Education," which have thus ridden along on the good reputation of good colleges. And certifying boards, we have seen, never look beneath the sheepskin.

Perhaps the chief way in which "Education" courses militate against high educational standards lies in the nature of those courses themselves. I have recently been examining a number of their standard textbooks, for I wanted to know whether the peculiar brand of piffle which insulted student intelligence in my day is still being served up by the professional theorist. I am grieved to report that it is. I grant that it is somewhat unfair to pick flaws in quotations taken out of context; I hope that this is in part offset by the fact that the books I should like to review here briefly are widely used, basic texts. They are apparently books which the Educationist considers *good*. Follow, if you will, the training of tomorrow's teacher through a normal series of "professional" training courses.

In his first such course, the core of his reading is Textbook A, a general introduction to the field of "Education." In the same year, in his other classes, our student may be successfully meeting the challenge of calculus, of qualitative chemical analysis, and of the history of philosophy. In *this* course he is regaled with verbiage like the following:

The measure of the holding power of a school is the extent to which the school retains its pupils until they have finished the course of study or until the pupils are transferred to another school, have died, or have become physically incapacitated further to attend school. Thus if a given school keeps all its pupils until they have met the conditions just mentioned, whereas another school keeps only 50 per cent of its pupils, the former has twice the holding power of the latter school. The holding power of schools and school systems varies widely; it varies from teacher to teacher, from school to school, from school system to school system, and from state to state. . . .



The regaling on this subject continues for another five hundred words or more, ending solemnly: "The school cannot expect to keep its pupils forever."

Our student spends precious college time reading a page which tells him how, as a teacher, to cooperate with the janitor. He is informed that "the janitor is a human being. . . ."

The usual technique is wonderfully illustrated when Textbook A calls attention to the fact (obvious, surely, to Johnny in his fourth grade) that learning begins before school age and goes on through life. To be sure, circumstances may well call for underlining or restating such a platitude. But the Educationist does not *state*. He *propounds* the obvious as a scientific discovery, and proceeds to demonstrate and *prove* it by dialectic and by citing the conclusive experiments of his colleagues. Thus:

Another erroneous assumption which is widespread concerning learning is that it is limited to the years of school attendance. Many persons believe that learning does not take place before the child enters school and that it ceases when the days of schooling are finished. Although casual observation had long forecast the falsity of the foregoing assumption, it was not until recent years that the problem was attacked experimentally and the assumption proved to be false by objective data.

The "proof" continues for two long pages, in which numerous "investigations" are reported. In the immortal words of Molière's Monsieur Jourdain, "Vive la science!"

After some 450 pages, our prospective teacher (if for some unfathomable reason he has continued to read his assignments) is informed of the teacher's importance:

In school affairs, the teacher primarily determines whether the school will be efficient or inefficient. "As is the teacher, so is the school." Although they can never be neglected in an educational program, such facilities as buildings, equipment, and supplies are of secondary importance compared with teachers. Granted that hovels were safe and sanitary, it would be better for children to attend school in them there to be instructed by excellent teachers than to attend school in palaces there to be under the tutelage of inferior teachers. James A. Garfield once defined an ideal school as "Mark Hopkins at one end of a log and a student at

the other end." In this definition Garfield was attempting to call attention to the indispensability of an excellent teacher, of which Mark Hopkins was a splendid example. He probably did not believe that a mere log—and any kind of a log—would suffice as the altar of instruction. He did believe, though, that school *personnel* was much more important than school *matériel*.

That would appear sufficiently repetitious for all time. But our forbearing student finally passes his course, and registers for one in "Methods of Secondary School Education," the so-called "general methods" course. Here he reads Textbook B. In it, after some thirty pages which inform him that the school is concerned with knowledge, skills, and attitudes, he is again told about the importance of the teacher. Various authorities are quoted. They think the teacher important. One at least has *proved* it: "The superior effectiveness of the teacher as contrasted with any merely material device was indicated repeatedly in the investigation." And then:

Reading such encomiums as these to the teacher brings to mind the familiar sentiment that a liberal education could be had with Mark Hopkins at one end of a log and the student seated at the other. The centrality of the teacher in any scheme of education seems indisputable. The galaxy of great teachers from every age whose influence upon succeeding generations continues to the present is clearly recognized, both in and out of professional circles. *If supporting evidence were necessary* (my italics), it would be simple for any student reading these lines to marshal before him names of great teachers of history whose teachings have influenced the course of human development. . . .

If supporting evidence is not necessary even in the mind of the Educationist, why have two pages of it been forced on our defenseless student?

Much is made of "teacher personality." That it is important is "proved" by the usual parade of authorities, and citation of "experimental evidence:" we are shown "...correlations of  $+0.72$  and  $+0.61$ ." Altogether, teacher personality is discussed for eleven pages; three statistical tables are introduced, one of them occupying two three-column pages of fine print. Twenty-one "teacher traits or qualities that appear significant" are listed;

it is gratifying to find that among these, *mirabile dictu*, are scholarship and teaching skill. It is finally deemed "safe to conclude that the emphasis upon personality in the past has not been misplaced."

Teacher health receives grave consideration: "Many causes are assigned to explain teacher illness." And do not for a moment doubt that those causes, which are just as applicable to a dozen other professions, are listed in full. . . .

Well, after a semester of this sort of thing, our student (mesmerized, no doubt, by now) starts his course in practice teaching, in connection with which he reads Textbook C. Although he may be intrigued by the profuse illustrations of ideal pedagogical surroundings and activities (girls' clubrooms, for instance, and mathematics classes which spend their time with paint brushes, making Chinese puzzles), he may be distressed over finding in the text proper only about six hundred words on "Teacher Personality." Still, he can console himself by working with the "Check List of Important Factors in the Teacher's Personality" which occupies two and a half pages of the Appendix. He may miss the comforting presence of Mark Hopkins and his log. . . but wait. The instructor in at least one such series of courses that I know feels that there is no single satisfactory textbook for practice teaching, so our student will be referred back to Textbook A. . . .

And evermore come out by that same door wherein he went.

Lest I be accused of ridiculing the content of these books, I hasten to admit that they all contain things which could profitably be known by a beginning teacher. But why should any student have to spend time wading in oceans of piffle, even if a few drops of wisdom might be distilled from them? At best, there is material here for one good book and one course. Why is it diluted and repeated in three? Neither student welfare nor education is served; the only benefit is to the Educationists, the enrollment in whose padded courses is thereby swollen.

## V

The effect of all this on the teaching profession is catastrophic. The students who would naturally make first-rate teachers are disgusted and turn to something else, which will challenge them.

The students who are actually attracted to such weak offerings in a college curriculum are the *last* ones to whom a parent should have to entrust the training of his children. Yet the teachers colleges, where such courses and texts are the *core* of the curriculum, must be bulging with this very type of student.

And so, under the present system, the satirical adage about teachers comes uncomfortably close to the truth: "Those who can, do; those who can't, teach." To which my disgruntled classmates in "Education" courses used to add: "And those who can't teach, teach teachers." Mark you, a minority of noble men and women, to the profession born, refuse to let themselves be swerved from their pedagogical goal by the unhappy facts and fancies of "Education." They become the best of our public school teachers, and to them I doff my hat, in deepest respect. Were they able to speak out in meeting with impunity, each of them could give supporting evidence for all my contentions. I have heard many of them, off the record, regret bitterly the time they were forced to waste on so-called professional training.

As a matter of fact, Educationists themselves admit the emptiness of their course offerings. It is their own jargon which has come to make the damning distinction between their "professional courses" on the one hand, and the "*content* courses" taught in other fields. It does not seem unreasonable to demand that if a course has no content, it be thrown out, and that the time devoted to technical teacher-training be cut down to whatever amount is fully justified by the slender content of "Education" courses—at a generous estimate, I should say something like a quarter or a third of the time now devoted to them.

To suggest a detailed plan for the solution of this whole vicious situation would be presumptuous. Educationists themselves would point with pride to the current stiffening of requirements in numerous States, but all that this means is more of the same thing. In some places, a secondary school teacher must hold a Master's Degree—a further quantitative requirement which does not imply any improvement in quality. Nothing prevents teachers in those States from following an undergraduate career rendered anemic by "Education" courses, then taking their "graduate" work in "Education" likewise, and getting licensed to teach subjects in

which they have had just one year of college work with a grade of sixty per cent.

In some ways, graduate work in "Education" is impressive. It must require a great deal of ingenuity to organize and teach the thirteen allegedly different courses in the methods of teaching science, and the eighteen courses in how to teach English, which are listed in the catalogue of one American university.

One interesting index of what is going on in a given field is always found in the titles of graduate school dissertations. It is edifying to discover that among theses for which Master's and Doctor's degrees have been granted in the last generation, there are such gems of liberal education as these:

A Study of Factors Affecting Scholarship in a College Fraternity  
 The Desirable Activities of Elementary School Supervising Principals  
 Opening Exercises in the Schools  
 A Study of the Frequency of Reference to the History of Education in Current Educational Literature  
 The History of the Baptist Sunday School from Its Beginnings to 1910  
 The Technique of Presenting School Business to Boards of Education  
 The Relations of Improvability in Language and Grammar to Intelligence  
 Some Reasons for Non-Attendance of Elementary School Children

No, that sort of thing is scarcely what I mean by better teacher-training, and one cannot look for more broadly, humanly educated teachers from that source.

What is needed, obviously, is a complete re-evaluation. What I dream of in my most optimistic moments is a monumental study and report by a serious and impressive Commission. My Commission would be made up of thoughtful men and women of broad background and sane views and complete integrity. It would include business men and Parent-Teacher Association officials and authors and educators. It would exclude Educationists with vested interests and pork-barrel politicians and crack-pots with an axe to grind for this or that special -ism. It would examine,

with no holds barred, all aspects of teacher-training, teacher selection, and teaching standards, and likewise the social and economic factors which also have turned so many "born teachers" away from the profession. It would after a few years bring to the American Public a report so simply conceived and so manifestly inspired that its recommendations would be immediately and universally adopted, thus finally releasing education from the stranglehold of "Education."

Well, maybe that is a pipe dream. But somehow or other, as free citizens in a democracy, we ought to make our own clear-cut choice between "Education" and education, for the two are incompatible. To date, the Educationists have made the choice for us.

The wrong choice.



## THE TECHNIQUE OF MAKING UNIVERSITY APPOINTMENTS<sup>1</sup>

By RALPH C. EPSTEIN

The University of Buffalo

"Reading," said Lord Verulam, "maketh a full man; conference a ready man; and writing an exact man...."

This bit of Baconian wisdom well summarizes certain basic principles connected with the appointment of university officers, be they professors, deans, or college presidents. For the problem of selecting new incumbents is at best difficult; and in the process of investigation, the appointing officers and committees, to be successful, must skillfully apply all three sets of tests. They must read a candidate's published works; they must write at length and receive written documents concerning him; above all, they must check the impressions received in those ways by talking with persons who know the candidate as well as with the candidate himself. The process of appraisal can be carried out in one way or another; it can be simple or elaborate, hasty or long drawn out, undertaken by a few appointing officers or by large committees. To achieve satisfactory results, however, the process must make use of certain principles of inquiry, without which few successful appointments are made. In the discussion that follows, these somewhat general dicta will be supported by specific examples from the writer's experience.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I wish to express thanks to the following persons who read this paper prior to publication: Professors Oscar A. Silverman and John H. Talbott, Presidents Edmund E. Day, John C. Baker, and Deane W. Malott; likewise, to Chancellor S. P. Capen and Professor Mary Cumpson, who were not asked to criticize the manuscript but whose advice and insight have helped me on numerous occasions in connection with appointment matters.

<sup>2</sup> As a department head for many years, during twelve of which he also served as dean of a university division, the writer has been responsible for perhaps 150 to 200 different appointments. While the appointments in all these instances were made by the Chancellor and Council (president and trustees), the work of selection and the initial proposals to divisional Executive Committees were undertaken by the author in cooperation with his immediate colleagues. Since the recommendations were invariably followed, the procedures and techniques herein described will be referred to elliptically as the process of "making appointments" rather than under the more technically correct heading, "the making of recommendations for appointments."

## II

When I recently remarked to a colleague upon the great need for the careful investigation of candidates being considered for a university presidency, he replied, "Do not all appointing committees, in view of the obvious importance of their work, investigate carefully and thoroughly before making a choice?" My answer was, "No. As a matter of fact, countless mistakes have been made and are currently being made in appointing men to teaching, research, or administrative posts." *In nearly all cases where poor choices are made, the reason can be simply stated: inadequate investigation.* This is equally true whether the appointments be of administrative officers or of professors.

The essentials of adequate investigation are three. The first is a sufficiently careful canvass of the field—the evaluation of as many potentially available and qualified candidates as possible. The second is the possession of a high degree of suspicion—the realization that men are not always what they seem to be, or what all their acquaintances say they are. The third is thoroughness—the willingness to expend time and money to check completely into the candidate's past history in terms of his capacity, character, and temperament. In the course of making something more than 150 different appointments, I have made serious mistakes<sup>1</sup> on two occasions; fortunately, only one turned into an appointment involving tenure. On both occasions, incompleteness of investigation was to blame.

How can one be sure he has canvassed the field? Why should one be suspicious, first, last, and always? How does one investigate? Why does one need to read, write, *and* talk about the candidate? And how can one know how much to believe of what people say about the candidate concerning whom inquiry is made?

<sup>1</sup> By "serious mistake" is meant one not susceptible of correction. I have made more than two mistakes in appointments; but by shifting men from duties they were first assigned to perform, and through suggestion, direction, and training, faculty members not well equipped for some kinds of tasks may often be utilized to advantage in others. If undertaken sympathetically, such direction and suggestion may accomplish the desired result without embarrassment to anyone.

We shall discuss these questions in no strict logical order, because they are interrelated.<sup>1</sup>

Suspicion is the *sine qua non* of appointment technique, simply because it is so easy to make mistakes if one is not suspicious. Commonly, a man is appointed by other men, most of whom do not know him personally. "You can never really know a person until you live with him" is a proverbial truth; yet appointing officers all too often ignore it. Candidates who know that they are under consideration almost always put on a special performance; consciously or otherwise, they take care to disclose some traits and to conceal others. For a man to be entirely natural during a period of interview is difficult; occasionally an individual wishes to be and can be, but most persons will not so behave.

Nor can appointing officers always tell the degree to which a man is revealing himself. Especially is this true in respect to traits of character and temperament, as distinguished from those of intellect and scientific competence. A session or two of "shop-talk" may indicate the level of a candidate's scholarly proficiency, but it may not show certain other aspects of his nature at all. Even in terms of scholarly competence, his written work and his ability to "give and take" in a technical session will suggest only his *present* level of achievement; they will not tell if the man has just reached, or is about to reach, a plateau.

For these reasons we ask outside scholars, as well as our own professors, the following questions: (1) What is your judgment of the candidate's scientific capacity and standing in his field, as of today? (2) What is your estimate of his probable relative professional standing five to eight years from today? (3) What is your judgment as to his possession of such temperamental qualities as open-mindedness and sense of intellectual balance? (4) What is your judgment of such personal qualities as *cooperativeness, generosity, modesty, patience, sympathy, honesty, tolerance*?

From all this it becomes clear that we do not flatter ourselves that

<sup>1</sup> Although the discussion is couched in terms of university appointments, most of the principles are equally applicable to professional and executive appointments in business and other fields. In nonacademic fields, usually somewhat less elaborate investigations are needed because appointments are seldom for permanent tenure and mistakes can be rectified; however, their correction—especially if extended term contracts have been made—may be costly.

we are such good "judges of men" as to tell much by meeting a person. First impressions are frequently unreliable; of this there can be no doubt. Who among us has not come heartily to dislike a man who on first acquaintance seemed charming, attractive, forthright? Conversely, can you not count, among colleagues whom you now admire, some persons to whom you were not greatly drawn when first you knew them? *The co-servant of suspicion on the part of the appointing officer is humility: one should ever be suspicious of his own competence as a judge.*

### III

Although it has varied somewhat with different candidates, our general technique of appointment has been as follows. We first canvass the field—very thoroughly if the appointment is a major one, less thoroughly if a less important post is involved.<sup>1</sup>

In the case of an important professorial post, we ask both our own professors and also from 15 to 30 persons in other institutions to nominate possible candidates, describing the position to be filled and giving the general salary range available. We obtain a large number of names from this source. Here again humility must operate: we do not assume that the only persons worth considering are those whose names automatically come to our minds, or whose work we happen ourselves to know well.

We then read the published work of each candidate whom we wish seriously to consider. If its high scholarly quality seems clear, we may now ask the man to visit us for a day or two or three, as a lecturer, or a round-table or seminar leader. He is not told that he is under consideration. If this initial impression is favorable, we then write to the 10 or 15 people who have known him well as a colleague, a student, a teacher, or in other relationships. We ask for full written appraisals of intellectual and character traits; these appraisals are kept in strict confidence. In the case of major appointments, we ordinarily use no questionnaire or rating form; we request individual personal letters. We

<sup>1</sup> An excellent discussion of the canvassing procedure is set forth by Professor Julian P. Bretz in a paper entitled "Selecting a President at Cornell," published in the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors, April, 1939, Vol. XXV, No. 2. We shall refer to this paper below.

specifically ask that faults and possible deficiencies be discussed as well as virtues. Because, over a period of 20 years, we have never violated a confidence, we often obtain surprisingly frank statements. Even when a frank statement is not supplied, often a brief remark or hint is thrown out that implies the need for further investigation. If one reads carefully between the lines, he often will scent clues of great importance. These clues may afford no more than initial "hunches"; but the hunches may point in directions that later yield verifiable information, *pro* or *con*. Frequently, however, as will appear shortly, we do *not* get revealing information by letter, either because the writers hesitate to speak freely, or conversely, because the writers are trying to "sell" a candidate who has outworn his welcome at his present institution.<sup>1</sup>

If the written reports seem sufficiently good and the man really interests us, then we may have him visit us again, this time asking him to come not to talk to students but to discuss the question of possible appointment.

When our choice is thus narrowed to two or three persons, we enter the final stage of decision. We have gone through the "reading" and "writing" stages. "Conversation" is next needed, for we have learned that sometimes there are some things about which men simply will not write as frankly as they will talk. The importance of the third stage can be illustrated by two cases.

One was of a man being considered for a full professorship. All letters about him were excellent. At the interview he showed great poise, charm, *savoir faire*, and presumptive evidence of being a good teacher. He was apparently desirous of receiving our final offer; he implied that an appropriate invitation would be accepted. Several of our staff were enthusiastic about him. His scholarly publications and reputation were excellent. But as a final step, we travelled to the two campuses where he had last taught, and there we talked to persons who knew him well: his administrative superiors, his peers, his juniors. Some of these had written us, some not. All of them, in conversation, now pointed to a serious temperamental and character defect that caused us not

<sup>1</sup> A college president friend of mine, who read this paper in manuscript, scoffs at placing any credence in letters of recommendation. This cynicism goes too far. If one has had previous experience with their writers and knows how to interpret them, some letters are extremely helpful—at least as partial evidence.

to offer the man an appointment. The fault was not so grave that our informants felt obliged to point it out in letters; but while it was of a kind that our correspondents would not set forth on paper, they spoke freely of it in conversation. We did not appoint the man, but had it not been for the conversations, we undoubtedly would have done so, probably to our everlasting sorrow.

The other case was that of a man concerning whom the first two tests yielded promising results; but we still had some reservations about his probable effectiveness as a teacher of undergraduates. Here again we went to his campus and talked with people. We also talked, unknown to him, with some of the students currently in his classes. The consensus was clear: our reservations were unfounded. The appointment was made and was almost completely successful.

I say "almost" (it was among our best) because few appointments are ever perfect. Men themselves are not perfect—the paragon of intellectual, moral, social, forensic, and administrative qualities does not exist. If perfection were the standard utilized, no appointments would ever be made.

*But this fact should never be allowed to serve as an excuse for careless or inadequate investigation.* The question is not whether a man has faults; the problem is to ascertain them, to determine the degree to which they are present, and to attempt to decide whether or not these faults are likely to make him a satisfactory or unsatisfactory appointee to the post for which he is being considered. One can never be absolutely certain; but care and thoroughness of investigation can indicate whether the probabilities are great or slight and will thus prevent serious mistakes.

#### IV

All that has been said relates to the appointment of professors; but it applies with even greater force to the appointment of presidents. Yet the high turnover of college presidents indicates that committees and trustees frequently investigate prospective incumbents most inadequately. Here the initial canvass is of the utmost importance. As Professor Bretz expressed it in describing the selection of Edmund E. Day as President of Cornell University,



One purpose [of Professor Bretz's paper discussing the work of the Cornell trustees-faculty committee] has been to make better known a mode of procedure which could not fail to be of interest to the professoriate everywhere. Another is to emphasize the value of a comprehensive search. It was amiably but cynically said, at the beginning of our work, that the Committee would canvass the entire country and then do what it might have done in three days' time, if not in three hours. This proved not to be true. The entire country was, in a sense, canvassed. The members of the committee have the satisfaction of knowing that the search was thorough and open-minded, and that, as a result of a careful sifting process, an entirely unanticipated result was reached.

*In making its canvass, an appointment committee should seek suggestions from any and all interested parties.* In the case of a professorship, all members of the department concerned should be free to make suggestions; in the case of a presidency, all members of the faculty should have similar opportunity. After the list is narrowed down to a few names by the committee, that fact should be made known, even though it would seldom be feasible to announce publicly the names. But if too close a seal is not put upon the lips of the individual committee members, the "word" will pass around rapidly enough. Time and opportunity should then be given faculty members to express themselves to the committee. For, if the committee possesses sufficient humility for its high task, it will not spurn any information or advice it can obtain.

Few committees will ordinarily possess many members who have known the candidates well; by broadening the base of possible knowledge, the committee may often learn much that is to its advantage. If the completely democratic procedure of inviting all faculty members to express their opinions and contribute such information as they may have is deemed impracticable in a large institution in the selection of a president, then certainly at least the department heads can be asked to do so. Through them can be obtained the contributions that individual staff members might make to the pool of knowledge which every good appointment committee seeks to make as large as possible.

## V

In sum, the technique of making appointments is both science and art. It is scientific to the extent that the relevant field is

surveyed, comprehensive data are collected, evidence is weighed, and conclusions are drawn. It is art rather than science because often conclusions cannot, on some points, be reached with any great degree of precision; one must sense some things, or think that he senses them, and hope for the best. There is a technique of investigation, of the collection of data, of assembling the materials; but there is no pat formula for their interpretation; here, as in other problems, experience counts; and judgment and common sense must be employed. The area in which "hunches" play a part should, however, not be wide; if the search and investigation have been thorough, it will be reduced to a minimum. And the percentage of poor choices will be cut drastically, benefiting both the institutions and the incumbents.

To make appointments without making frequent mistakes is not easy; it requires both courage and hard work. The factor of courage enters because one must often say "no" to the importunities of friends and colleagues, and must resist pressures by those who would unduly hasten the process and thus endanger the results. Great labor is entailed not only because very complete dossiers must be collected and numerous personal interviews must be held, but because the process essentially involves attempting to appraise human beings. In all such efforts, it may be repeated that humility, open-mindedness, caution, and eternal vigilance are the only safeguards.

## Censured Administrations

Investigations by the American Association of University Professors of the administrations of the several institutions listed below show that they are not observing the generally recognized principles of academic freedom and tenure, endorsed by this Association, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Law Schools, the American Library Association (with adaptations for librarians), the American Political Science Association, and the American Association of Teachers Colleges.<sup>1</sup>

Placing the name of an institution on this list does not mean that censure is visited either upon the whole of the institution or upon the faculty but specifically upon its present administration. The term "administration" includes the administrative officers and the governing board of the institution. This censure does not affect the eligibility of nonmembers for membership in the Association, nor does it affect the individual rights of our members at the institution in question, nor do members of the Association who accept positions on the faculty of an institution whose administration is thus censured forfeit their membership. This list is published for the sole purpose of informing our members, the profession at large, and the public that unsatisfactory conditions of academic freedom and tenure have been found to prevail at these institutions. Names are placed on or removed from this censured list by vote of the Association's Annual Meeting.

The censured administrations together with the date of censuring are listed below. Reports of investigations were published as indicated by the *Bulletin* citations.

West Chester State Teachers College	December, 1939
West Chester, Pennsylvania (February, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 44-72)	
Adelphi College, Garden City, New York	December, 1941
(October, 1941 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 494-517)	
University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Missouri	December, 1941
(October, 1941 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 478-493)	
State Teachers College, <sup>2</sup> Murfreesboro, Tennessee	May, 1943
(December, 1942 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 662-677)	
Winthrop College, Rock Hill, South Carolina	May, 1943
(April, 1942 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 173-176)	
University of Missouri, Columbia and Rolla, Missouri	June, 1946
(Summer, 1945 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 278-315)	
University of Texas, Austin, Texas	June, 1946
(Winter, 1944 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 627-634; Autumn, 1945 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 462-465; Summer, 1946 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 374-385)	

<sup>1</sup> Reorganized in 1948 as the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

<sup>2</sup> Now Middle Tennessee State College.

# AMERICAN ASSOCIATION *of* UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

1101 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

## *What It Is - - What It Does*

The American Association of University Professors is the professional organization for college and university teachers and investigators in the United States and its territories, in Canada, and in American controlled institutions of higher education abroad. For the academic profession its rôle and functions are analogous to those of the American Bar Association for the legal profession and the American Medical Association for the profession of medicine. It grew out of a conference of representatives of universities called by the Faculty of The Johns Hopkins University in 1913. The organizational meeting was held in New York City on January 1 and 2, 1915. The nature and purposes of the Association are indicated in the following statement of objectives formulated on that occasion:

To bring about more effective cooperation among the members of the profession in the discharge of their special responsibilities as custodians of the interests of higher education and research in America; to promote a more general and methodical discussion of problems relating to education in institutions of higher learning; to create means for the authoritative expression of the public opinion of the body of college and university teachers; to make collective action possible, and in general to maintain and advance the ideals and standards of the profession.

Throughout its history the Association has sought to develop and strengthen the professional concept among college and university teachers to the end that these objectives might be attained. Through its central office, its several committees and its Council,

the Association serves as a clearing house for the consideration of policies and problems of the profession.

### *Committees*

The Association maintains committees on the following professional subjects: Academic Freedom and Tenure, Author-Publisher Contracts, Cooperation with Latin-American Universities, Economic Welfare of the Profession, Educational Standards, Encouragement of University Research, International Relations, Library Service, Pensions and Insurance, Place and Function of Faculties in College and University Government, Preparation and Qualification of Teachers, Professional Ethics, Relation of Junior Colleges to Higher Education.

The Association also maintains organizational committees on: Admission of Members, Financial Resources of the Association, Organization and Conduct of Chapters, Organization and Policy.

### *Academic Freedom and Tenure*

Independently and in cooperation with other educational organizations, the Association has sought the formulation, the recognition, and the observance of principles, practices, and procedures conducive to freedom of thought, inquiry, and expression. The most recent enunciation of these principles and procedures is set forth in the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. These principles have the endorsement of the Association of American Colleges, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the Association of American Law Schools, the American Political Science Association, the American Library Association (an adaptation for librarians), and the American Association of University Professors.

Through its Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the Association has conducted many investigations of alleged violations of the principles of academic freedom and tenure and in certain instances has published reports in the *Bulletin*. There is abundant evidence that this work of the Association has been effective in stabilizing tenure in our institutions of higher education, thereby furthering academic freedom which cannot exist without the economic security provided by continuity of tenure.

### *Annual Meetings*

The Constitution of the Association provides for an Annual Meeting of the membership. Prior to 1947 the Annual Meeting of the Association was held in connection with a meeting or meetings of subject matter organizations, *viz.*; American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Economic Association, American Historical Association, American Political Science Association, Association of American Law Schools, and the Modern Language Association of America. Beginning with 1947 the Annual Meeting has been an independent meeting and has been held in late February in a different geographical area each year—in 1947, Boston, Massachusetts; in 1948, St. Louis, Missouri; in 1949, Washington, D. C.

Sessions of the Annual Meeting usually extend through two days, preceded and followed by sessions of the Association's Council. The programs consist of addresses, reports of committees, symposia, and forum discussions on subjects of concern to all college and university teachers and to all others who are interested in higher education.

### *Bulletin*

The Association publishes a quarterly journal, the *Bulletin*, which is sent to all members. The *Bulletin* is an educational journal, presenting articles and reports of concern to all who are interested in, or are a part of, our institutions of higher education. It has an increasing nonmembership circulation, particularly among college and university administrative officers and trustees, and is contributing greatly toward a wider recognition of the "professional" concept of teaching and research and the "associates" concept of the Faculty-Administration relationship. The subscription price of the *Bulletin* for nonmembers in the United States is \$3.00 a year. Foreign subscriptions for nonmembers, including those in Canada, are \$3.50 a year. Single copies are available for purchase. In all cases the postage is prepaid.

### *Studies*

The Association has from time to time formulated policies and conducted special studies, as indicated in the following citations:



## Academic Freedom and Tenure.

Declaration of Principles, *Bulletin*, December, 1915 (reprinted, Spring, 1948).

Statements of Principles: 1925 Conference Statement and 1940 Statement, *Bulletin*, Spring, 1949.

Annual Reports. Current Spring *Bulletin*.

Conditions of Tenure. *Bulletin*, April, 1932.

Freedom of Teaching in Science. *Bulletin*, February, 1925; December, 1927.

College and University Teaching. *Bulletin*, May, 1933, 122 pp.

Depression, Recovery and Higher Education. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1937, 543 pp.

Employment of Graduate Student Assistants and its Effect on Quality of Undergraduate Instruction and on Graduate Work of the Student Assistants. *Bulletin*, February-March, 1926.

Faculty Salaries and Salary Schedules in Selected Institutions. *Bulletin*, Winter, 1948.

Federal Income Tax Returns. Published annually in Winter *Bulletin*.

Honorary Degrees and the Basis for Conferring Them. *Bulletin*, December, 1917.

Methods of Appointment and Promotion. *Bulletin*, March, 1929.

Methods of Increasing the Intellectual Interest and Raising the Intellectual Standards of Undergraduates. *Bulletin*, February, October, 1922; October, December, 1923; May, October, November, December, 1924; November, 1925; February-March, April, October, 1926.

Migration and Interchange of Graduate Students. *Bulletin*, October, 1921.

Normal Amount of Teaching and Research for Professors. *Bulletin*, March, 1930; March, 1931.

Place and Function of Faculties in College and University Government. *Bulletin*, March, 1920 (reprinted in May, 1924); March, 1936; March, 1937; February, 1938; April, 1939; April, 1940; April, 1941; Spring, 1948.

Relation of Vocational to General Higher Education. *Bulletin*, November, 1925.

Required Courses in Education. *Bulletin*, May, 1930; March, 1933.

Requirements for the Master of Arts Degree. *Bulletin*, February, 1931; March, 1932.

Requirements for the Ph.D. Degree. *Bulletin*, January-February, 1919.

Status of Women in College and University Faculties. *Bulletin*, October, 1921; November, 1924.

Summer School Organization. *Bulletin*, March, 1919.

Systems for Sabbatical Years. *Bulletin*, March, 1931.

### *Chapters*

Whenever the Active Members at any eligible institution number seven or more, they may organize a chapter. Upon the election of a seventh Active Member, one or more members may call an organizational meeting.

The principal functions of chapters are: (1) to consider questions of concern to college and university teachers; (2) to consider current local questions of educational policy or method; (3) to act as an initiating agency for faculty action; (4) to take action upon specific matters of Association business submitted to the chapters by the Association's Council or its central office; (5) to cooperate with the Council and central office of the Association in dealing with problems of the profession.

The standing Committee on Organization and Conduct of Chapters, with membership on a geographical basis from sixteen regions, maintains relations with chapter officers and arranges for occasional regional meetings in which a number of chapters may participate.

At present the Association has 384 organized Chapters.

### *Growth*

The Association has had a gradual and encouraging growth. Beginning with 1362 charter members, the membership has increased as follows:

January 1, 1920.....	2,388
January 1, 1925.....	5,591
January 1, 1930.....	7,986
January 1, 1935.....	11,500
January 1, 1940.....	15,330
January 1, 1945.....	17,970
January 1, 1947.....	21,238
January 1, 1949.....	33,638

The membership is distributed in 792 accredited colleges and universities and represents approximately one-third of all eligible college and university teachers.

## MEMBERSHIP

### CLASSES AND CONDITIONS—NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Membership in the American Association of University Professors is open to all college and university teachers from the faculties of eligible institutions and to graduate students and graduate assistants. The list of eligible institutions is based primarily on the accredited lists of the established accrediting agencies subject to modification by action of the Association. Election to membership in the Association is by the Committee on Admission of Members upon nomination by one Active Member. Election takes place thirty days after the name of the nominee has been published in the *Bulletin*. The membership year in the Association is the calendar year (January 1 through December 31). The membership of nominees whose nominations are received before July 1 becomes effective as of January 1 of the current year. The membership of nominees whose nominations are received after July 1 becomes effective as of January 1 of the following year unless the nominee requests that his membership become effective as of January 1 of the current year.

The classes and conditions of membership are as follows:

*Active.* A person is eligible for election to Active membership if he holds a position of teaching or research with the rank of instructor or higher in an institution on the Association's eligible list, provided his work consists of at least half-time teaching or research. Annual dues are \$4.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

*Junior.* Junior membership is open to persons who are, or within the past five years have been, graduate students in eligible institutions and who are not eligible for Active membership. Junior Members are transferred to Active membership as soon as they become eligible. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

*Associate.* Associate membership is not an elective membership. Active and Junior Members whose work becomes primarily

administrative are transferred to Associate membership. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

*Emeritus.* Any member retiring for age from a position in teaching or research may be transferred to Emeritus membership. Emeritus Members are exempt from dues. They may continue to receive the *Bulletin* at a special rate of \$1.00 a year.

*Continuing Eligibility.* Change of occupation or transfer to an institution not on the Association's eligible list does not affect eligibility for continuance of membership.

*Interruption or Termination of Membership.* Interruption or termination of membership requires notification to the Association's Washington office. In the absence of such notice, membership continues with receipt of the *Bulletin* for one calendar year, during which time there is an obligation to pay dues.

### Nominations for Membership

The following 1224 nominations for Active membership and 26 nominations for Junior membership are published as provided in the Constitution of the Association. Protests of nominations may be addressed to the General Secretary of the Association who will, in turn, transmit them for the consideration of the Committee on Admission of Members. The Council of the Association has ruled that the primary purpose of this provision for protests is to bring to the attention of the Committee on Admission of Members questions concerning the technical eligibility of nominees for membership as provided in the Constitution of the Association. To be considered such protests must be filed with the General Secretary within thirty days after this publication.

#### *Active*

Adelphi College, Irene J. Abelow, M. Esther Bloss, August F. Cantfil, Mary Jane Cook, Frida M. Frischauer, J. Edward Hayden, John F. Storr, Margaret White; University of Akron, Alice A. Kauffman, Raymond J. Nelson; Alabama Agriculture and Mechanical College, Richard D. Morrison; Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Basil Cimino, Gabriel Guevrekian, Joe Peterson, Sidney Lee Thompson; Alabama State Teachers College (Florence), William J. McIlrath; Alabama State Teachers College (Jacksonville), Mary F. Edwards, Harvey J. Wilson; University of Alabama, Herbert A. Sawyer; Albion College, David

L. Strickler; **Albright College**, Ellery B. Haskell, John W. Khouri; **Alfred University**, Leon B. Bassett, Wayne Brownell, H. O. Burdick, Marion L. Fosdick, John Freund, Thomas A. Hall, W. Varick Nevins III, Willis C. Russell, Lelia E. Tupper, Rae Whitney; **American International College**, Ethel Cosmos, Ephraim Fischhoff, Robert L. Hemond, Mary B. O'Connell, Alice R. Robinson, J. Clyde Sumsion, Charles A. Wells, Kenneth Zimmer; **American University**, David J. Brandenburg; **Amherst College**, James Eells, Jr.; **Arizona State College (Flagstaff)**, J. Alfred Anderson, William H. Harris; **Arizona State College (Tempe)**, Everett R. Shaw; **University of Arkansas**, Robert M. Soldofsky; **University of Arkansas (Little Rock)**, James S. Dinning, Barbara Kelley.

**Baldwin-Wallace College**, Ralph K. Davies; **Barat College**, Grace M. Jaffe, Jean E. Saurwein; **Bates College**, John R. Willis; **Baylor University**, Sarah L. Henry, Mary E. Norvell; **Bennington College**, Paul Matthen; **Berea College**, Jean M. Wyre; **Blackburn College**, Marion M. Wolcott; **Boston College**, William B. Hickey; **Boston University**, Kingsbury Badger, Robert K. Brandriff, Arthur M. Griffing, Philip S. Haring, Felix C. Maidana, John P. Mallan, Elinore B. Trowbridge, Richard M. Verrill; **Bowdoin College**, Raymond A. Bournique, E. Parker Johnson, Perley S. Turner; **Bowling Green State University**, Warren S. Allen; **University of Bridgeport**, Leo I. Burrington, Michael W. Macek; **University of British Columbia**, Ralph D. James; **Brooklyn College**, Harry Bernstein, Roberta Christie, Feliks Gross, Edward O. Lutz, Carleton Washburne, Arthur D. Zinberg; **Brown University**, E. Burrows Smith; **University of Buffalo**, Donald H. Bullock, Robert D. Gordon, John P. Henderson, Lysander Kemp, Thomas W. Kennelly, Dora W. Osborn, Ford R. Park, Jr., Janet C. Potter, Nathan Shenfeld, Eugene Vasilew.

**California State Polytechnic College**, Ralph W. Dilts, Frederick M. Essig, Henry E. Gray, James A. McInerny, Glenn A. Noble, David H. Thomson; **University of California**, Edward L. Barrett, Jr., Howard A. Bern, Shih-hsiang Chen, Leland E. Cunningham, Gordon Griffiths, Lawrence Grossman, Sears R. Jayne, Richard W. Jennings, Norman S. Waner, **University of California (Los Angeles)**, E. Clinton Adams, Joseph B. Birdsell, Alan E. Flanigan, John S. Helmick, George H. Hildebrand, Donald S. Howard, Kenneth Macgowan, Jessie Rhulman, Margaret Robertson, Henry Schnitzler; **University of California (Santa Barbara)**, Elsie A. Pond; **Carnegie Institute of Technology**, Paul Saunders; **Case Institute of Technology**, Salvatore Cicirello, Leslie L. Foldy, Parry Keller, Jr., Aaron L. Nelson, James E. Rice, Richard M. Robinson, Deonisie Trifan; **Catawba College**, Betty Barbour, Reid Jann; **Catholic University of America**, Carlette Engel de Janosi; **Cedar Crest College**, Clayton H. Chapman, Helene-Edith Frey, Lewellyn J. Moss, Mildred L. Russell, Walter E. Wiest; **Chapman College**, John Browning, Richard Goolian, James W. Utter, Jr., Gwen R. Waters; **College of Charleston**, Henry Miller, Jr.; **University of Chattanooga**, Durwood C. Harvey; **Chicago City Junior College (Wright Branch)**, Kostis T. Argoe, Franklin R. Lindquist; **University of Chicago**, Carlos Castillo, J. Carson McGuire, Harvey S. Perloff, Daniel D. Williams; **University of Cincinnati**, Rachel Bergman, Walter S. Houston, Clair E. Hubert,

Robert A. Mace, James M. Vail; **The City College (New York)**, Bernard W. Aginsky, Warren G. Brown, William K. C. Chen, John W. Collier, Alfred P. Parsell, Thomas A. Spitz, Morris Swadesh, Sam Winograd; **Clark College (Washington)**, Ruth Orndorff; **Clark University**, John H. Blair; **Clemson Agricultural College**, John Goodman; **Colby College**, Charles N. Bacon, Philip S. Bither, Alice P. Comparetti, Ermanno F. Comparetti; **Colgate University**, Edwin Downie, Carl Keul, John M. Longyear III; **Colorado College**, Alvin Foote; **University of Colorado**, Margaret A. Blythin, Curtis W. Martin, Joseph D. Park; **Columbia University**, Robert E. Cosgrove, Nathan Edelman, Otis E. Fellows, André von Gronicka, Willis E. Lamb, Jr., Robert S. Lynd, Herbert W. Schneider, Werner Sewald, William S. Vickrey; **Concord College**, Kathryn Whittaker; **Connecticut College**, Maria Kosko, Bernice Wheeler; **Teachers College of Connecticut**, Ulysses E. Whiteis; **University of Connecticut**, Judith Holman, Violet T. Schroeder; **Cornell University**, Arthur H. Bernstein, Cheng-Yang Hsu, Bert Lear, Mary Marquardt, Harold E. Moore, Jr.

**Dartmouth College**, Francois Denoeu, Francisco Ugarte; **Del Mar College**, William M. Hager; **De Paul University**, William R. Crowley, Paul Daily, Armin Grams, Kenneth K. Henning, Earl G. Whipple, Thomas J. Wynn; **Dickinson College**, John S. Steckbeck; **Drake University**, Lewis E. Caswell, Gerald K. Chinn; **Duquesne University**, Paul R. Betz, Reyes Carbonell, R. Gordon Dippel, Tage U. H. Ellinger, Virginia D. McCullough, George McFadden, Frank P. Numer, Patrick M. O'Donnell III, George A. Robertson, Jr., John R. Schlicht, John T. Stratton, H. Harry Szmant.

**Emory University**, Lynwood M. Holland; **Eureka College**, Leonard W. H. Charnock, Oran V. Myers.

**Fenn College**, Robert B. Auld, Samuel H. Berwald, Lloyd C. Billings, Vance Chamberlin, William Cherubini, Randle E. Dahl, George H. Faust, John A. Froebe, V. Richard Gulbenkian, Virgil D. Hales, Millard L. Jordan, C. Virginia Kiel, John G. McGrew, John W. McNeill, John C. Matthews, William F. Moore, Jr., Chester W. Topp, Donald R. Tuttle, Karl H. Van D'Elden; **Fisk University**, Ferdinand Gowa; **Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College for Negroes**, James Hudson; **Florida Southern College**, Ambolena H. Robillard; **Florida State University**, Waymah B. Barber, Clarence F. Blake, Howard G. Danford, Edward Eikman, Herman Gunter, Jr., Dorothy L. Hoffman, Dean Johnson, Richard H. Jordan, Russell C. Kirkpatrick, H. Rowland Ludden, Robert J. Massey, Glen E. Murphy, James Preu, Wallace W. Reichelt, William H. Rogers, Vivian B. Schneiderman, Robert N. Sedore, Lyman D. Toulmin, Lucile Wagner, Kenneth L. Yudowitch; **University of Florida**, Russell E. Bagley, Robert G. Blake, William A. Fullagar, Warren E. Green, James C. Morelock, Charles E. Reid, Merrill J. Roberts, Paul Tarrant; **Franklin College of Indiana**, Margaret A. Sparling; **Fresno State College**, Forrest D. Brown; **Furman University**, Robert N. Daniel, Jules A. Medwin, Lewis C. Vinson.

**George Washington University**, Charles E. Bish, Jacqueline C. Buhrman, Robert M. Cooper, Muriel H. McClanahan, William F. Sager, William L. Turner; **George Williams College**, Sylvanus M. Duvall; **Georgia Institute of**



**Technology**, J. C. Horton Burch, M. J. Goglia, Martin L. Gursky, Chandler H. Holton, August Kadow, Jr., Frank A. Kopf, Isaac E. Saporta; **Georgia State Woman's College**, Margaret Deavor, William M. Gabard; **University of Georgia**, Ruth Sane; **University of Georgia (Atlanta Division)**, James E. Routh; **Gustavus Adolphus College**, James S. Douglas, Mary A. Ericson, Margaret Ermarth, Lucy D. Fryxell, Nels P. Langsjoen, Marvin Larson.

**Hahnemann Medical College**, Albert Lupton; **Hanover College**, Arthur R. Porter, Jr., Walter L. Stone; **Harvard University**, Richard D. Ellmann; **Haverford College**, Marcel M. Gutwirth; **Hillyer College**, Edward F. Humphrey, Kurt Weinberg; **Hofstra College**, Edward C. Sampson; **University of Houston**, A. A. White; **Hunter College**, Ethel G. Aginsky, Dorothy B. Ball, Hannah Holzman, Elaine F. Howard, Rose S. Kiesler, Herbert N. Otis, Doris L. Trepel.

**Idaho State College**, Donald Lundberg; **University of Idaho**, Edward A. Cebull; **Illinois College**, Joachim A. Stenzel; **Illinois Institute of Technology**, George E. Danforth, W. Grant Ireson; **Eastern Illinois State College**, Helen L. Devinnay; **Western Illinois State College**, Kathleen J. Brophy; **Illinois State Normal University**, Edna I. Kelley, Genevieve A. Pohle, Winifred W. Schlosser; **Northern Illinois State Teachers College**, Bernadine C. Hanby; **University of Illinois**, Eva F. Benton, Emerson Cammack, Mary L. Chase, Marian Harman, R. P. Oliver, Edward L. Phillips, Chester G. Starr, Jr., Eugene Weigel; **University of Illinois (Navy Pier)**, Martha H. Mackin; **Indiana Central College**, John L. Gehr, John E. Hill, Leo S. Miller, William G. Miller, Archie G. Mullins, Richard D. Rowley, Allan F. Schirmer, Kenneth J. Sidebottom, Eugene T. Underwood; **Indiana State Teachers College**, Merle S. Brown, Gertrude Ewing, Bertha W. Fitzsimmons, Wenonah Goshorn, Beulah V. Hartman, Florise Hunsucker, Caroline S. Kelso, Kathryn M. Kennedy, Inez L. Mauck, Mary Helen Price, Edward I. Reasor; **Indiana University**, William M. Barr, William S. Gustin, Victor W. Koepsell, Arthur Schweitzer; **Iowa State College**, Lionel K. Arnold, I. W. Arthur, Harriet L. Berger, W. Chester Fitch, Virgil Salera; **Iowa State Teachers College**, James T. Blanford, Henry Harris, Emma Opfer, Herbert K. Tjossem, Robert H. Weber; **Iowa Wesleyan College**, S. Carl Fracassini, J. Roland Palangio, Jane H. Palangio, Harry L. Wilkey.

**John B. Stetson University**, Janie W. Goolsby, Lemuel A. Haslup; **Johns Hopkins University**, John De Francis, Vincent G. Dethier, Bruce W. Ward-ropper.

**Fort Hays Kansas State College**, F. W. Albertson, Edward C. Almquist, Ralph V. Coder, Gaynelle Davis, Naomi Garner, Samuel M. Hamilton, Leland E. Heinze, Leon W. Hepner, Geneva Herndon, Ralph Huffman, Harlan B. Johnson, Jack W. Juergens, Harriet Ketchum, Lawrence B. Lee, Rosella McCarrroll, Robert P. Marple, Edwin P. Martin, W. D. Moreland, Ila Newbecker, Charles C. Onion, Verna Parish, Kathryn S. Riddle, Jack W. Rodgers, Lester J. Schmutz, Cade Suran, Fred Unruh; **Kansas State Teachers College (Emporia)**, Rolland A. Alterman; **Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg)**, Eugene Larkin; **University of Kansas**, Leland S. Bohl, Kenneth E. Coombs,

Anni W. Frankl, Joseph C. McGoughran, Jackson O. Powell, Otho M. Rasmussen, William R. Terrell; **University of Kansas City**, Charles T. Daniel, Royal C. Gilkey, Anna H. Koffler, Lawrence W. Kuhl, Loren E. Morey, John Newfield; **Kent State University**, Caro M. Carapetyan, Jeanne Gilbert-Ver Heyden, Ralph S. Kaczor, Earl Kelly, James MacCampbell, Verna F. Walters, Henry N. Whitney; **Kentucky State College**, Robert L. Jack, Rutha W. Jack; **Eastern Kentucky State Teachers College**, Fred A. Engle, Dean Gatwood, William B. Hopp, Margaret H. Morberly, Horace W. Raper, Blanche Seevers, James W. Stocker, Thomas Stone, Gladys P. Tyng; **University of Kentucky**, Ward W. Bauder, James S. Brown, Edward B. Hornowski, Ralph W. Stacy; **Kirksville College of Osteopathy and Surgery**, James A. Keller, Wallace M. Pearson.

**LaGrange College**, Lottie M. Peirce; **Langston University**, William H. Martin; **LaSalle College**, Charles F. Smith; **Lewis and Clark College**, Ruth P. Chindgren, Reinhard G. Pauly, Alice F. Wieman; **Limestone College**, Mary P. Glenn; **Lincoln University (Missouri)**, Irma Leathers, Arthur E. Pullman, Jr.; **Southeastern Louisiana College**, Howard W. Kidd, Elmer E. Puls; **Southwestern Louisiana Institute**, H. Waldo Wasson; **Louisiana Polytechnic Institute**, Francis O. Adam, Jr., Robert E. Emmer, Winnie D. Evans, Lawrence J. Fox, Lester M. Garrison, Wallace Herbert, Fairy C. McBride, William L. Mitchell, Robert W. Mondy, Richard M. Pullig, M. Louise Smith, W. Benson Temple; **Louisiana State University**, William F. Beyer, Jr., Lindsay S. Olive, Minns S. Robertson; **Loyola University (Louisiana)**, Victor H. Baker; **Luther College**, Frederic A. Giere; **Lynchburg College**, Bronislaw E. Matecki.

**Macalester College**, Vincent W. Carpenter, Lenore Erik-Alt, A. Elizabeth Leinbach, Julius Lichtenstein, Jack Patnode, William A. Swain, David White; **University of Maine**, Joyce C. Stevens, David W. Trafford, Robert M. York; **Manhattan College**, Thomas J. Durkin, Jr.; **Marietta College**, Warren Bruner; **Marquette University**, Kevin B. Herbert; **Marshall College**, Ralph M. Edeburn, Dorothy A. Fisher, Florence Thomas; **University of Maryland**, James F. Condell, Mary L. de Give; **Massachusetts Institute of Technology**, Charles D. Coryell; **Massachusetts State Teachers College (Framingham)**, Miriam A. Riley, Bernice W. Taylor; **University of Massachusetts**, Lawrence M. Bartlett, William Haller, Jr., Jay H. Korson, Theodore T. Kozlowski, Ames S. Pierce, Frank P. Rand, Floriana Tarantino, H. Leland Varley; **University of Massachusetts (Ft. Devens)**, Solomon H. Gordon; **Meharry Medical College**, Georgia L. Rutland; **Memphis State College**, Calvin M. Street, Joseph R. Taylor, Alma Whitaker; **Mercyhurst College**, John A. Donatelli; **Meredith College**, Clyde N. Parker; **University of Miami**, Forrest E. Adams, C. Edward Anderson, José A. Balseiro, Clayton C. Campbell, C. R. Crabbe, Marinus J. Dijkman, Richard A. Hausler, Milton Kelner, Richard D. Kreske, William J. Lee, Elizabeth H. Marsden; **Northern Michigan College of Education**, Albin E. Fritz; **Western Michigan College of Education**, Leonard C. Kercher; **Michigan State College**, Ralph W. Lewis, Henry A. Stoehr; **Michigan State Normal College**, Carl Hood; **University of Michigan**, Joseph F. Albano, Philip C. Davis, Carl H. Fischer, Robert S. Redmount, Ralph G. Stanton, Morgan

Thomas; **Middlebury College**, Leo M. King; **Millsaps College**, Albert F. Sanders; **Minnesota State Teachers College (St. Cloud)**, Arthur F. Nelson; **University of Minnesota**, David V. Erdman, Gerald Feese, Paul Fetler, Rodolfo O. Floripe, Earl R. George, John W. Gustad, Cyril J. Hoyt, Thelma E. Hunter, William P. Jensen, Blanche Kendall, Gisela Konopka, Mary Malcolm, Douglas G. Marshall, Margarita W. Mills, Andreas G. Papandreou, William H. Rodgers, William Schofield, William G. Shepherd, Anne S. Winslow; **University of Minnesota (Duluth Branch)**, Chester W. Wood; **Mississippi State College**, William S. Anderson, J. L. Anthony, Ferris S. Batson, Hugh W. Bennett, William E. Christian, Jr., Roland Cowart, Bascom K. Doyle, Robert C. Eckhardt, J. B. Edmond, Felix E. Edwards, Morris D. Finkner, James P. Gaines, L. E. Gholston, William R. Glover, Monica Goen, G. D. Green, C. Dale Hoover, William C. Howell, Ulysses S. Jones, Marion Kelley, Emmett A. Kimbrough, Jr., John W. Lusk, Preston H. McDonald, John C. McWhorter, Spencer B. Murray, Jean P. Overcash, Carlton H. Ragland, John C. Redman, Edward G. Roberts, David J. Savage, Henry J. Smith, A. D. Suttle, Harvey B. Vanderford, Robert B. Watson, George B. Welch, Darrell G. Wells, Helen C. White; **Mississippi State College for Women**, Thelma Eaton; **University of Mississippi**, Gerald Forbes; **Northeast Missouri State Teachers College**, Eugene W. Smith; **University of Missouri**, Melville B. Evans, Vladimir E. Hartman, Charles E. Vogan; **Missouri Valley College**, Evelyn E. Powell; **Monmouth College**, C. Donald Vogel; **Montana State College**, Joseph C. Osborn; **Montana State University**, James R. Anthony, William H. Coldiron, Lois D. Cole, Hasmig G. Gedickian, Earl C. Lory, George Perkins, Bernice B. Ramskill; **Morgan State College**, Winfred O. Bryson, Jr., Rosalyn O. Furlonge, Maurice A. Lee, Lawrence H. Middleton; **Morningside College**, Ray O. Burks, Jr., Hans Lampl; **Mount Holyoke College**, Grace E. Perkinson; **Muhlenberg College**, A. Eric Bubeck, Charles A. Hollister, Perry F. Kendig, Robert E. Lorish; **Multnomah College**, Helen H. Douglas; **Muskingum College**, W. Hughes Barnes.

**National College of Education**, Gwendolyn Addenbrooke, Helen Challand, Marjorie Hunter, Louise Neusbaum; **Nebraska State Teachers College (Wayne)**, Arthur J. Looby; **University of Nebraska**, E. H. Beckmann, Josephine E. Brooks, Julius H. Cahn, John F. Davidson, Darrell D. Deane, Curtis M. Elliott, Anne Harder, Joseph V. Harmon, Jr., W. T. Lenser, Ruth F. McNaughton, William L. Messmer, Katherine Nash, Lois Natanson, Leonard Nelson, Darrel J. Peters, Carol E. Puckett, Elizabeth Quinton, David W. Seyler, Ellen Shively, Adam S. Skapski, Paul R. Stewart, Merle A. Stoneman, Arther S. Trace, Maxine Trauernicht, Alma Wagner, Jessie A. Warden, John C. Whaley, Ramey C. Whitney; **University of New Hampshire**, Howard S. Bretsch, Alice P. Foster; **New Jersey State Teachers College (Trenton)**, Mary V. Gaver; **New Mexico State College**, Mildred A. Barrett, Chester H. Linscheid; **New Mexico State Teachers College**, Leonora Sherman; **University of New Mexico**, David T. Benedetti, Rubén Cobos, John Dunbar, Dexter H. Reynolds, Robert F. Utter; **New York State Teachers College (Cortland)**, Ralph A. Brown, Cranston H. Jordan, Wava T. McGrath, Walter E. Mul-

holland, H. Kenyon Stell, Gustave B. Timmel; **New York State Teachers College (Fredonia)**, Frederick Ambellan, Isabel J. Bond, Vivian M. Robe; **New York State Teachers College (Geneseo)**, Hazelle Berkness, Dorothy M. Cleveland, Bruce K. Moore; **New York State Teachers College (Oswego)**, William S. Chiverton, Alvar H. Jacobson, Rocco E. Lorusso; **New York University**, Edward L. Anderson, Arthur Z. Arnold, Morley Ayearst, J. Darrell Barnard, Charles E. Barrett, Jr., Ruth G. Batchelor, Lauretta Bender, Ethel T. Bendixen, Louis L. Bergmann, J. Lewis Blass, Max Bogart, Roswell S. Britton, Lucinda N. Bukeley, Louis R. Burman, Lionel Casson, R. Anthony Castagnaro, Austin H. Church, David H. Colin, Richard Courant, William T. Dean, Jr., Martin B. Dworkis, William F. Ehret, Robert S. Emerson, Amy M. Erickson, Kurt O. Friedrichs, Vera S. Fry, John F. Glaser, Wallace Gobezt, Abraham Goldstein, Sanford D. Gordon, Charles Gottlieb, William M. Greenhut, Pinckney J. Harman, Jules M. Hoffman, Albert Hofstadter, Milton Hollins, Ralph E. Hone, Rod W. Horton, Lawrence E. Howard, Milton Hyman, Merritt B. Jones, Lillian W. Kay, Leona M. Kerstetter, Harold R. Klein, Robert B. Kramer, Madeline S. Levine, Joseph D. Mandel, Michael Mastrosimone, David Mayer, Samuel C. Miller, John H. Mulholland, Rita W. Nealon, A. M. Nielsen, John P. Nielsen, Julius N. Obin, Ernest Parkes, Maryann Peins, Joseph Pick, Elliott Polansky, Paul W. Proctor, Durward Pruden, William T. Putney, Jr., James A. Rawley, John G. Rockwell, William Rosenbaum, Maurice J. Saklad, Emanuel A. Salma, John C. Schoonmaker, Leonard K. Schreiber, Helen K. Seiden, Paul M. Sheldon, Andrew W. Shook, Sidney Sorrin, Jesse D. Stark, James S. Stewart, Hans-Lukas Teuber, Robert L. Thompson, Sidney Towne, Atwood H. Townsend, Richard Turner, Ethel Tyrrell, S. Woodrow Van Court, Jeannette Veatch, Martin Weinberger, Charlotte B. Winsor, George J. Witkin, Robert L. Workman; **Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina**, Herman Brown, Akiki K. Nyabongo; **North Carolina College at Durham**, Virginia A. Brooks, Floyd H. Brown, Rose B. Browne, Owen P. Cooke, Victoria C. Davis, Helen G. Edmonds, Clarence R. Elam, Mamie Elam, W. B. Fletcher, Stewart B. Fulbright, Esther P. Henry, Irma K. Johnson, Edith Lamarre, Omeda R. Livingston, Evelyn F. Luckey, Irving A. McCollum, John B. McLendon, Brooklyn T. McMillon, William Malone, Isham G. Newton, Pauline Newton, Earl W. Phillips, Evelyn B. Pope, Benjamin F. Smith, James T. Taylor, Daniel A. Williams; **University of North Carolina**, Susan G. Akers, James C. Andrews, William J. Daniel, G. Gordon Ellis, Fletcher M. Green, Clifton L. Hall, Samuel M. Holton, Sydney Lester, John V. Myers, Elaine von Oesen, Alton G. Sadler, Stuart W. Sechriest, Joseph W. Straley, John J. Wright, Paul Young; **Woman's College of the University of North Carolina**, Josefina Escajeda; **North Central College**, Walter K. Klass, Paul Schach; **North Dakota Agricultural College**, Carl H. Schmidt, William Wiidakas; **North Dakota State Teachers College (Valley City)**, Vera E. Bolinger, Henriette L. Brudos, Susan McCoy, Ina C. Robertson; **University of North Dakota**, J. Walter Cobb, Philip B. Cory; **Northwestern University**, Deming B. Brown, Franklyn S. Haiman, Charles Hall.

**Oberlin College**, Richard M. Murphy; **Occidental College**, Kenneth Kurtz;

**Ohio State University**, Eleanor Anawalt, David Bakan, Robert H. Bremner, Erika Eichhorn, Elijah J. Gordon, Charles D. Hendley, John H. Herrick, Aurèle LaRocque, Louis Nemzer, Manny N. Schor, David Spitz, Delos D. Wickens; **Ohio University**, Donald W. Krimel, William H. Olpp; **Ohio Wesleyan University**, Clifford O. Berg; **Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Malcolm Correll, Abraham Eisenstark; **Central State College of Oklahoma**, J. Ralph Reed; **University of Oklahoma**, Harley P. Brown, Ruben Landa, Edwin C. McReynolds; **Olympic Junior College**, Harry E. Peterson; **Oregon State College**, Oliver H. Heintzelman, Richard M. Highsmith, Jr., Willard L. Shelton; **University of Oregon**, Charles E. Bures, Paul E. Eiserer, Roderick G. Langston.

**Pennsylvania College for Women**, T. Carl Whitmer; **Pennsylvania State College**, Helen Adolf, Ralph E. Armington, Arnold W. Asman, Esther A. Atkinson, Stephen J. Bilo, Richard M. Bower, Thomas D. Bowman, Clarence S. Bryner, Beckford F. Coon, R. L. Cowan, Harry M. Crain, Hugh M. Davison, Ray B. Duggins, Otis D. Duncan, George M. Dusenberre, Raymond S. Farwell, Jr., A. H. Forbes, Abram J. Foster, John A. Fox, Cyrus E. French, William H. Gordon, Jr., Harry M. Hochreiter, Jr., Ruth R. Honey, Marguerite E. Horn, Robert H. Ingram, Melvin W. Isenberg, Frank A. Joy, Thomas C. Kavanagh, Amy M. J. Kerstetter, Georg E. Knausenberger, Russell E. Larson, Winton Laubach, A. Roberts Leisner, John E. Linde, George M. Lott, Joseph J. Lowden, Robert H. McCormick, Leslie G. McCracken, Jr., Agnes R. McElwee, Donald A. McGarey, James H. Moyer, Roland E. Mueser, George E. Murphy, R. Russell Murphy, Raymond C. Murphy, Jr., Glenn L. Musser, Vernon W. Myers, Margaret A. Neuber, Charles J. Noll, Martin L. Odland, Elwood F. Olver, Robert B. Patrick, Frances B. Pearson, Andrew J. Pepper, Roy B. Power, Jr., Richard G. Praeger, Alfred O. Rasmussen, Elbert B. Reynolds, Jr., Russell A. Rusk, Dorothy B. Scott, Paul B. Sebring, Charles J. Smith, Cyril B. Smith, Kendon R. Smith, Walter C. Snow, William Spackman, Jr., Jerome Steffens, J. Kenneth Stern, Robert E. Stiemke, Harold I. Tarpley, Charles A. Thomas, Edward G. Thurston, Charles H. Tindal, Richard C. Vincent, Carl Volz, Marshall J. Walker, Harold V. Walton, Gertrude Weaver, Benjamin A. Whisler, Delpha E. Wiesendanger, Wayne H. Wilson, Wesley P. Winter, Clyde J. R. Witman, Richard W. Wonn; **Pennsylvania State College (Swarthmore Center)**, William W. Ullery; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (East Stroudsburg)**, Donald B. Corson, Elvena Mattson; **University of Pennsylvania**, John R. Abersold, Ray H. Abrams, Ernest Bender, Sculley Bradley, Clarence N. Callender, Bernard F. Cataldo, Arthur B. Gabel, Walter S. Peake, Charles M. Weber, Harvey C. L. Wilson, Jr.; **University of Pittsburgh**, Donn E. Bair, Denton Beal, Howard W. Bradley, Thurlow W. Brand, William Dusenberry, Henry C. Fisher, Dorothy Miller, Max Molyneux, Florence Poole, Oscar J. Reckard, Lester H. Roth, Lois C. Schuette, Helen T. Simons, George M. Stewart, Robert M. Sullivan, Ruth A. Sydney, Robert Zugsmith; **University of Puerto Rico**, Osiris Delgado, Monelisa L. Pérez-Marchand; **College of Puget Sound**, Robert Gardner; **Purdue University**, John S. Karling, Ernest Sheppard.



**Queens College (New York)**, Edmund P. Kurz.

**Reed College**, Arthur H. Leigh; **Rhode Island State College**, Ray M. Batchelder, Chester W. Houston, Arthur L. Svenson; **Rocky Mountain College**, Roberta R. Anderson, James A. Dawson, Charles L. Smith; **Rollins College**, Eugenie M. Grand; **Rutgers University**, George R. Blake, Ardath W. Burks, Harold E. Clark, Charles C. Cumberland, C. Rexford Davis, Ruth Emery, Clifford D. Firestone, John L. Frederick, Frederic C. Genzmer, Claude Hill, Anders S. Lunde, Paul W. Massing, Richard Schlatter, Milton F. Seiden, Norman L. Stamps, Ulrich P. Strauss, David R. Walters.

**St. John's University**, Joseph S. Berenson, Robert F. Bonagura, Bernard J. Ficarra; **St. Joseph's College**, William J. Bodkin, Jr., Andrew J. Malahan, Joseph A. Raffaele, Francis J. Vastano; **St. Lawrence University**, Concha Bretón, J. Richard Gilbert; **St. Louis University**, Charles Chapman; **St. Petersburg Junior College**, Anne Nossing; **College of St. Thomas**, Frederic A. Bieter, Mathias J. Gillen, Donald M. Medley, George E. Toman; **Sam Houston State Teachers College**, Arthur W. Angrist, Joseph B. Snodgrass; **San Diego State College**, Janet McGaughey; **City College of San Francisco**, Irene E. Mensing; **San Francisco State College**, S. Joseph DeBrum, Leon Lassers, Margaret L. Leonard; **San Jose State College**, Charles P. Guichard, Alston H. Haggerty, Henry C. Meckel, Dolores F. Spurgeon; **Colleges of the Seneca**, Robert H. Bagley, Charles G. Barton, David Braybrooke, Constance A. Brewer, Richard W. Day, Henry Grattan, Bernice A. Kaplan, Donald S. Labigan, Chauncey F. Minnick, Lois Nellis, Maxine V. Pease, Marguerite Rouchaud, Charles J. Schott, Johann Schulz, George V. Walsh; **Seton Hall College**, Maurice W. LeCalvez; **Simpson College**, Carlton A. Chaffee, Herbert J. Markle, Roberta Riegel; **Skidmore College**, Elizabeth B. Watts; **South Dakota State College**, C. Maynard Fox; **University of Southern California**, Arthur J. Knodel; **Southern Methodist University**, Alvin J. North; **Southern University**, Jean F. Emmons, Aguinaldo A. Lenoir; **Springfield College**, John L. Steele; **Stanford University**, Donald G. Reuter; **Stephens College**, David A. Brown, Leland T. Rodgers; **Superior State College**, Esther M. LaRowe; **Syracuse University**, J. Calvin Callaghan, Margaret Finn, Paul W. Gilbert, Erik Hemmingsen, C. V. Holmberg, Eugene Jagust, Marshall W. Jennison, Robert P. Lett, Clinton M. Osborn, Sidney Sukoenig; **Syracuse University (Utica College)**, Morton Asch, Walter J. Bruns, Althea Criley, Virgil C. Crisafulli, R. Eileen Heinig, Abraham P. Kustoff, J. Howard Richards, Joseph Roberts, Owen Roberts, Mary V. Salamey, Arthur W. Saltzman, Charles E. Samuels, Lester J. Start, Glenn E. Thompson, Henry A. Varhely.

**Temple University**, John A. Brown, Jr., Katherine Frey, Robert H. Haakenson, Mary Hamilton, W. Glenn Moss, Morton J. Oppenheimer, David L. Robbins, Romulo R. Soldevilla, Harry L. Weinberg; **University of Tennessee**, John M. Carpenter, Clarence E. Hall, Bascom H. Story; **Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas**, Jack O. Ashworth, Ernest R. Bulow, Lawrence S. Dillon, Bill C. Moore; **Texas Christian University**, Dan L. Anderson; **North Texas State College**, Gerhardt Dorn; **Texas State College for Women**, Mary L. Jackson; **Texas State University for Negroes**, Ebert W. D'Anton,



Edgar D. Draper; **Texas Technological College**, William C. Irvin, Grace Wellborn; **University of Texas**, Janice E. Christensen, Howard S. Dye, Phil M. Ferguson, Parker C. Fielder, Charles Holzwarth, Paul Kelpo, John J. Kurtz, Frederic Meyers, Dick S. Payne, Glenn V. Ramsey, Jack A. Scanlan, Karl L. Selig, Howard R. Williams; **University of Toledo**, Robert E. Dillon, Lucille B. Emch, Mary M. Gillham, Walter Gross, Hazel D. G. Petcoff, Harold T. Towe; **Tufts College**, James A. Clarkson, C. Fred Gurnham, Elmer R. Trumbull, Jr.; **Tulane University of Louisiana**, John R. Betts, Robert Hodes; **University of Tulsa**, Ruth Green, Virginia Myers.

**Union College (Kentucky)**, Lester H. Colloms; **Union College and University**, Arthur K. Davis, Hans Hainebach, Edward Marz, Harold C. O'Neal; **Union University**, Rosa D. Rutledge; **United States Naval Academy**, Ivor Wayne; **University of Utah**, Donald K. Barton, Ruth M. Jones, Stanley Mulaik.

**Vanderbilt University**, Abbott L. Ferriss; **Vassar College**, Edith J. Richards, Susan J. Turner; **Villanova College**, Raymond F. Adams, Francis J. Blanchard, Jr., Albert Borowik, Charles P. Bruderle, Paul J. Ernst, Anthony J. Frayne, Alexander Gero, Martin J. Gillan, Jr., William M. Gorman, Joseph C. Greyson, William C. Hampton, Francis Hendry, James L. Henry, Daniel A. Holland, Joseph T. Jonas, Eugene W. Kiefer, John I. McEnerney, James P. McWilliams, Karel Marecek, James L. Miller, Michael J. O'Donnell, Jose de Pedroso, Miles B. Potter, Bohdan P. Procko, Geroge N. Quam, Joseph W. Ratigan, Henry L. Rofinot, Carmen F. Storti; **Virginia Polytechnic Institute**, Joseph B. Dent, Frank A. Vingiello.

**Wabash College**, Robert V. Ormes; **Washburn Municipal University**, Terry D. McAdam, Charles I. Sager; **Washington College**, James W. Kerley, Rinaldo C. Simonini, Jr.; **Eastern Washington College of Education**, Louise V. Cash; **Washington and Jefferson College**, Robert P. Ashley; **Washington University**, Samuel I. Weissman; **University of Washington**, Sidney W. Bijou, C. Vernon Cannon, Allen L. Edwards, Robert L. Kahn, Herman C. H. Meyer, James W. Richeimer, Franz R. Sommerfeld; **Wayne University**, Chester E. Jorgenson, Gabriel W. Lasker; **Wesleyan University**, Vincent W. Cochrane, Donald Herzberg, Russell T. Limbach, Arthur Mitchell, James K. Moorhead, J. Alden Nichols; **West Virginia State College**, Ernest N. Ashley, Jr., Kermit C. King; **Western Reserve University**, John W. Culver, Joseph H. Friend, Harry R. Gasker, Clarence T. Gilham, Clark C. Livensparger, James B. Whipple; **Westminster College (Missouri)**, Gilbert P. Davis, Horatio A. Mangan; **Westminster College (Pennsylvania)**, Henry W. Calvert; **Wheaton College (Massachusetts)**, August C. Miller, Jr., Anne Rechnitzer; **Whittier College**, Roberta J. Forsberg; **College of William and Mary**, Joseph Curtis; **Wisconsin State Teachers College (Milwaukee)**, David D. Malcolm; **Wisconsin State Teachers College (River Falls)**, Esther A. Howard, Phyllis L. Simon; **Wisconsin State Teachers College (Whitewater)**, Hugo E. Lahti; **University of Wisconsin**, Stanley G. Knight; **Wittenberg College**, J. Robert Blackburn, Robert E. Hawes, Elmer C. Jurkat, Robert J. McKnight, Otto Reimherr, Frank D. White, John T. Williams.

**Yale University**, John Rodgers, William M. Walton; **Yeshiva University**, Philip E. Kraus; **Youngstown College**, Karl W. Dykema.

### *Junior Members*

**University of Buffalo**, Francis J. Wozniak; **University of Connecticut**, Robert W. Stone; **University of Denver**, Robert Q. Massaro; **Duquesne University**, Peter M. Puccetti; **Loyola University (Illinois)**, Paul J. von Ebers; **University of Michigan**, Arthur W. Forbes, Victor Garwood, Warne C. Holcombe; **New York University**, John A. Patten, Milton E. Rose; **Pennsylvania State College**, Willard P. Acheson, William D. Brand, Emlyn B. Davies, Mary A. Lawson, Freda Phillips, Daniel G. Reiber; **University of Pennsylvania**, Solomon Leon; **Princeton University**, Edward M. Stack; **Colleges of the Seneca**, Charles A. Lininger, Jr.; **University of Southern California**, Donald R. O'Connor; **Syracuse University**, Joseph V. Totaro; **University of Washington**, Karl E. Zink; **Not in Accredited Institutional Connection**, Meredith G. Eller (Ph.D., Boston University), Lebanon, Illinois; Roland A. Sorensen (Graduate Student, New York University), Oskaloosa, Iowa; Carl E. Weyland (Graduate Student, University of Pennsylvania), Camden, New Jersey; Hans J. Wolff (Graduate Student, University of Michigan), Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

### **Elections to Membership**

The Committee on Admission of Members announces the election to membership in the Association of 1673 active and 39 Junior Members, as follows:

#### *Active*

**Adams State College**, James P. Hatfield, Julian Samora; **Adelphi College**, David Boroff, Gladys M. Darby, Joseph Grunwald, William Henderson, Raymond Makofske, Helen Perle, Joan E. Thimm; **University of Akron**, Einar G. Anderson, Julia Anich, Edward A. Paul; **Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Robert A. Carter, V. Murray Chambers, Elsie H. Wallace; **Alabama Polytechnic Institute**, John S. Dendy, William B. McGehee, J. M. Robinson; **University of Alabama**, James F. Caldwell, Frank V. Cosby, John A. Dean, William D. Jordan, Eve Lewis, Susie Lee Ward; **University of Alaska**, Ellen M. Brinsmade, C. Charlene Craft, Nady Denie, Lorraine F. Donoghue, Katharine S. Duroe, Alfred M. Ewing, Blanche Nicolai, Antonia Ratliff, Mary A. Sheahan, Clyde G. Sherman, Donald G. Yerg; **Albion College**, William J. Gilbert, Loren E. Hanna, John H. Lavelly, Lotta M. Rogers; **Alfred University**, Salvatore J. Bella, Alexander Kuman, Myron K. Sibley; **Allegheny College**, Jack F. Culley, Mildred A. Ditty, Ralph G. Dunlop; **American International College**, Olive Durgin, Gilman A. Randall; **American University**, Edgar O. Bowles, Stephen P. Hatchett, Russell V. Person; **Am-**

herst College, Ellsworth E. Richardson; **Appalachian State Teachers College**, John G. Barden, John J. van Noppen, Lee J. Reynolds, Wiley F. Smith, John H. Workman; **Arizona State College (Tempe)**, Joel A. Benedict, James A. Bird, Loring M. Carl, David A. Conlin, Ernest Feder, Hugh Hanson, Ambrose D. Holford, William Kajikawa, Orus F. Krumboltz, Lewis Larmore, Mary McKinnin, Dean F. McSloy, Shelley M. Mark, Martin Mortensen, Albert J. Onofrio, Collice H. Portnoff, H. Barry Rose, Catherine R. Thomas, Loretta Willson; **University of Arizona**, Alice M. Boyle, Bartley P. Cardon, Edna E. Church, George W. Lotzenhiser, Donald B. Marsh, Robert S. Svob, Lyle M. Young; **University of Arkansas**, Clifford N. Cassidy, John Clark, Jr., Mona E. Dingle, Jack C. Gilchrist, Harold D. Hantz, Richard J. Hostetter, Jennie L. Milton, Carl Patton, Jr., Mary A. Stuttle, H. W. Sundwall.

**Baldwin-Wallace College**, W. Roland Cook, Donald S. Dean, Frederick C. Ebbs, Eugene H. Fellers, Betty D. Gotshall, Charles G. Irwin, Bernard J. Oliver, Jr., Glenn A. Schnittke, E. Eugene Weaver, Edmund B. Wright; **Ball State Teachers College**, Georgina Hicks, Thomas H. Wetmore; **Bates College**, Doyle M. Bortner, Patricia S. Robinson; **Baylor University**, Charles F. Bouschor, Veloy H. Creasey, William A. Dickson, Stephen P. Forrest, Ruth Gilbert, Bernhard Gottlieb, Andrés Sendón, James L. Shepherd III; **Berea College**, Preston J. Stegenga, Ruth J. Uhrhan; **Bluefield State College**, Ethel M. Miles, Phillip G. Wells; **Boston College**, A. Kenneth Carey, William A. Carito, John C. Conway, Arthur L. Glynn, Owen A. Hanley, Francis J. McDermott, Rene J. Marcou, John J. Mulligan, Edward J. Rooney, James E. Shaw, Leon M. Vincent; **Boston University**, George Beal, Alice F. Behymer, Richard C. Carpenter, Robert Chin, Walter N. Durost, Winifred M. Gibson, John B. Giever, Mary A. Gunn, Elizabeth J. Hall, John Harrison, George E. Hatvary, Arthur H. Hauge, Doris C. Hinds, Ruth Langley, Helen A. Murphy, Robert B. Partlow, Jr., Jane S. Phillips, Wilbert Pronovost, Bill Read, Joseph F. Sanders, Morrill M. Slack, Frank L. Steeves, Helen B. Sullivan, Frank L. Sweetser, Jr., Lucien B. Taylor; **Bowdoin College**, Frederick Aandahl, Jr., Philip C. Beam, Robert S. Brumbaugh, A. Cheever Cressy, Jr., Robert D. Elliott, Lawrence S. Hall, Edward S. Hammond, Robert M. McNair, Norman L. Munn, George H. Quinby, Albert S. Roe, Walter M. Solmitz, Frederic E. T. Tillotson; **Bowling Green State University**, Eleanor Boettke, John R. Davidson, Mabel Drennan, Dale Haven, J. Levan Hill, Ernestina Malnati, Ann Marley, Eve Mocek, Donald C. Peterson, William Weiersheuser; **Bradley University**, Philip S. Baker; **University of Bridgeport**, David Brown, Henrietta M. Grimsley, Curtis Ledford, Eric Marcus, Ralph H. Pickett, Anita P. Riess, Joseph Schafer, Harry L. Wechter; **Brigham Young University**, Arthur R. Watkins; **University of British Columbia**, David C. Murdoch; **Brooklyn College**, William A. Behl, Robert W. Ehrich, Orient Lee; **Brown University**, Elmer M. Blistein, William F. Church, Edward R. Durgin, James B. McGuire, Lorrin A. Riggs, William J. Robbins, Murray S. Stedman, Jr., Boris C. Swerling; **Bryn Mawr College**, Rosalie C. Hoyt; **Bucknell University**, Harold W. Heine, Leon E. Krouse, Donald G. Ohl, Gordon Poteat; **University of Buffalo**, Paul A. Bacon, Anthony T. Balint, W. H. Warren Ball, Victor Barnouw,

Lowell P. Bassett, Richard J. Costello, John C. Fisher, Walter J. Fleming, Jr., William V. Freer, Lawrence L. Giller, Harold L. Malt, Norman Miller, Charles H. Murrish, Kevin B. O'Callahan, Edward W. Schuh, Richard L. Temnitz, Allen F. Williams; **Butler University**, Frank J. Albert, John C. Appel, George S. Barber, Werner W. Beyer, William B. Cameron, Searle F. Charles, C. Ross Dean, Harold S. Frum, Thomas M. Gregory, Roy Marz, Ray A. Miller, Paul W. Nicely, Bradford Noyes, Gabriel D. Ofiesh, David C. Pellett, Lawrence Stine, J. Hartt Walsh, Naomi A. Whitesell, William Young.

**University of California**, Henry W. Elliott, Arthur E. Hutson, Hans Lewy, Carl B. O'Brien; **University of California (Santa Barbara College)**, Joseph E. Lantagne, Lyle G. Reynolds; **Carroll College**, George A. Olson; **Case Institute of Technology**, Charles Saltzer; **Catawba College**, Millard Wilson; **Centenary College of Louisiana**, Marion E. Barnett, Edmond M. Parker; **Central College (Iowa)**, John H. Wesle; **Chapman College**, Gustav Albrecht, Ellen B. Atherton, Mary C. Bordeaux, Donald C. Perkins; **University of Chattanooga**, Georgia L. Bell, Harold J. Cadek, Joyce Evans, John T. Gray, Gail S. Hammond, Selma E. Herr, Stuart J. Higginbotham, Jean M. Pettitt, Stuart R. Purser, Irene Wheeley; **Chicago City Junior College (Wilson Branch)**, Harold L. Appell, Sidney M. Bernstein, Robert J. Dvorak, Olga Evanoff, Lela Hanmer, Frank X. Henke, Arthur E. Hunter, Lawrence E. Olsen, Dorothy R. Patton, Macklin Thomas; **Chicago City Junior College (Wright College)**, Agatha Cavallo; **University of Chicago**, Donald W. Fiske, Charles F. Nims, Edgar S. Rose, Pol Swings, David G. Williams; **University of Cincinnati**, Millie C. Almy, Reyman E. Bonar, Richard Cosway, Helen J. Crossen, R. Stanley Gex, Ernest B. Haswell, Mary E. Light, Frank E. Liguori, Robert B. Lowry, Margaret G. McKim, Clarence C. Mills, Ralph S. Rice, William D. Schwarberg, Clara G. Stratemeyer, Robert A. Toepfer, Herbert B. Weaver, John A. Winget; **The City College**, Arnold Bernstein, Henry Eilbirt, Mary D. Haithcock, Irving Sklansky, Ira Zasloff; **The City College (Commerce Center)**, André Nicolle; **Claremont Men's College**, Ronald M. Reifler; **Clemson Agricultural College**, Gilbert W. Biggs, Claire O. Caskey, James R. Cook, Curtis E. Hutton, Koloman Lehotsky, Charles E. Littlejohn, Jr., John M. Rush, Chester R. Smith, I. A. Trively, Raymond E. Tyner, William P. Van Eseltine, Richard F. Wheeler, Roy Wood; **Colby College**, Walter N. Breckenridge, Robert V. Burdick, Jean K. Gardiner, Frank H. Giraud, Herbert S. Michaels, Robert W. Pullen, Cecil A. Rollins, Walter B. Seeley, Walter Wagoner, Knowlton M. Woodin; **Colorado Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Robert L. Davis; **Western State College of Colorado**, Clarence Rockwell, Byron C. Yale; **University of Colorado**, Herman I. Arenson, Isaac Bacon, Maurice B. Davies, Leta P. Di Salvo, John B. Ellery, Francis J. Geck, Frederick H. Good, John M. Griest, Kenneth R. Hammond, Burton W. Jones, Morris H. Levine, Hope Lowry, Norbert L. Shere, Parry C. Stroud, E. Edwin Weibel; **Columbia University**, Arthur R. Burns, Eveline M. Burns, Gordon F. Derner, Ralph R. Fields, Carter Goodrich, John E. Gorrell, Raymond D. Mindlin, Ernest Nagel, Raymond Villers, Ernest W. Williams, Jr.; **Concord College**, Florence I. Bradley, Harry Finkelman, Joseph Friedl, Robert Kyle, Sanford Watts;

Connecticut College, Harriet W. Allen; University of Connecticut (Fort Trumbull Branch), William Marcuse, Helen S. Thompson; Cooper Union, Lawrence H. Dworetzky, Floyd Hasselriis, Harold W. Merritt, Frank C. Mirgain, Donald N. Read, Jesse B. Sherman, Jack Yampolsky; Cornell College, Paul Koepke; Cornell University, Paul E. Ramstad, James E. Sever, Helen K. Staley; Culver-Stockton College, Frances Waggener.

Dartmouth College, Martin L. Lindahl, John H. Wolfenden; University of Delaware, Lincoln Armstrong, Hazel J. Baker, Alan F. Clifford, Lewis W. Gleekman, Edwin C. Heinle, John H. Meister, Harold B. Raymond, Abraham Shuchman, Moises Tirado, Marie-Luise Wolfskehl; Denison University, Kalman D. Archibald, Shirley Power; University of Denver, Leslie K. Grimes, Goldwina N. Phillips; De Paul University, F. Emile Audet, John E. Burns, Robert E. King, Thomas R. Masterson, Willard Munzer, Anabel M. Scanlon; DePauw University, Raymond H. French; Dickinson College, Bertram H. Davis, John R. Embick, M. Lucie Fitzpatrick, David I. Gleim, Charles D. Kepner, David Kirk, W. Wright Kirk, May Morris, Arthur M. Prinz, Horace E. Rogers, Lewis G. Rohrbaugh, Henry E. Smith, Joseph B. Smith, Herbert Wing, Jr.; Drake University, Harold C. Krogh, William R. McIntyre, Paul H. Ptacek, S. Austen Reep, Leonard W. Towner; Drury College, Lora Bond; Duke University, George Baylin, Helen K. Castellano, John W. Everett, Frank A. Hanna, Geloco McHugh, Harold T. Parker, Benjamin E. Powell, Arley J. Walton, Thomas G. Wiener; Dunbarton College of Holy Cross, Alice K. McLarney.

Elon College, Hans E. Hirsch; Evansville College, Harold R. Bottrell, Maurine Breeden, Robert R. Buell, Nicholas D. Cannici, Pearl Grabowsky, Thomas S. Harding, Dora L. Hess, James Julian, Florence Keve, John Kronsbein, John L. Loos, Mae R. Pietila, Edward E. Potter, C. H. Slusher, Dorothy R. Tapp, Mildred K. Taylor, Agnes L. Tomplins.

Fairleigh Dickinson College, Clair W. Black, Leon H. Canfield, Michael A. Costello, Harold Feldman, William B. Higgins, Kathleen C. Hillers, William T. Kirscher, Sidney J. Kronish, Julius O. Luck, Howard R. Mirkin, Louise Palladeno, Dorothy Reeves, William G. Robinson; Fairmont State College, Hayden M. Carmichael, George R. Hunt; Fisk University, Elmer Schoettle; Florida Southern College, Roy S. Kiser, Elaine B. Minnis; Florida State University, Howard C. Busching, Grace E. Cairns, David E. Christensen, Wendell L. East, George F. Holschuh, Adolph Karl, Laura C. Lee, Markham J. McEnroe, Stanley Maron, Otis M. Montgomery, Samuel R. Neel, Jr.; University of Florida, John D. Anderson, S. S. Block, Louie T. Camp, Frederick H. Hartmann, Benjamin B. Leavitt, John H. Owen, Milton E. Ryberg, G. Ballard Simmons, Louis A. Waters, Jr.; Franklin and Marshall College, R. Randall Cole, Frederick W. Van Name, Jr.; Fresno State College, Marjorie R. Armstrong, Frank M. Boolsen, John A. Buehler, Jr., Raymond E. B. Fagan, Arthur W. Gutenberg, Edwin Lombard, Betty R. McGee, George E. Nichols III, Vincent E. Petrucci, Bernard A. Shepard, Wallace Smith, Ernest Wild.

Georgia Institute of Technology, Clyde A. Goodrum, W. Richard Metcalfe; Georgia State College, J. Randolph Fisher; University of Georgia (Atlanta



Division), John A. Alexander; **Gettysburg College**, Robert H. Fryling, Nathaniel L. Kaderly, Allen C. Percival, William A. Stuart, Lewis E. Weeks, Jr., Earl E. Ziegler; **Good Counsel College**, Antoinette Coloccia; **Green Mountain Junior College**, Dorothy A. Cole, John E. Davis, Kathleen E. Stokes; **Gustavus Adolphus College**, George F. Hall.

**Hamilton College**, John W. Blyth, William Welch; **Hamline University**, Keith W. Irwin; **Hampton Institute**, Helen M. Seller, Henry N. Switten; **Harris Teachers College**, Mabel Seidlitz; **Harvard University**, Elizabeth A. Lockwood; **University of Hawaii**, Tom E. Abrams, Muriel Bergstrom, Harold M. Bitner, Philip L. Bridgham, Leslie J. Briggs, Suzanne C. Fauvet-McLaughlin, Edith Lord, John J. Naughton, William L. Neumann, Mildred Riedesel, Bert Shepard, Albert L. Tester; **Hillyer College**, John Balmer, Chester E. Baston, Robert G. Drew-Bear, William M. Farris, James K. Haynes, Warren E. Kudner, Raymond Lawley, Elizabeth C. Lindsay, Carmela Nazzaro, Ragnvald Randeberg, Harry P. Schmidt, Merrill B. Sherman, Harold H. Shively, Kenneth A. Shutts, Milton S. Smith, James J. Sullivan, Henry Swift; **Hofstra College**, Bernard Beckerman, Juliet Geymet, Alfred R. Oxenfeldt, Claymer Schluter; **College of the Holy Cross**, Edward J. Hogarty, Vincent O. McBrien, Raymond E. McDonald; **Howard University**, Fred H. Blum; **Humboldt State College**, Burton Henry; **Hunter College**, Ruth Bell, Alexander M. Bernyk, Gertrude R. Jasper, Arthur E. Lorch, David G. Salten, Frederic W. Stewart, Robert Strassburg, Annita Tuller, Elizabeth A. Weber, Frederick L. Zimmermann.

**Northern Idaho College of Education**, Patrick M. Murdock; **Idaho State College**, DuWayne L. Goodwin, Wilmer F. Jacob, Arlene Morgan; **Illinois Institute of Technology**, James W. Fairchild, Manley H. Jones, Arthur H. Mankin, Ernest F. Masur, Hooper A. Williams; **Western Illinois State College**, George W. Mulder; **Illinois State Normal University**, Ralph A. Benton, Beryl T. Galaway, John W. Green, Elizabeth Russell, Raymond W. Tudor; **Southern Illinois University**, Jack S. McCrary, Richard L. Morse; **University of Illinois**, O. Herman Erickson; **University of Illinois (Navy Pier)**, Edwin W. Berg, Rebecca L. Elbinger, Richard H. Elliston, Clarence H. Gillett, Joseph L. Glojek, Josef M. Gutnayer, Joy L. King, Albert J. Schneider, Sam Silbergeld, Henry F. Williams, C. Craig Wilson; **Illinois Wesleyan University**, Ralph E. Browns, Cloyce Campbell, Wayne F. Caskey, Lowell B. Hazzard, Howard H. Hoogesteger, Louise H. Johnson, Rupert Kilgore, Oliver R. Luerssen, Robert H. Moore, Vera C. Saar, Daryl E. Williams; **Indiana University**, Richard F. Ericson, Malcolm J. McLelland, John H. Roseboom, **Iowa State College**, Erwin C. Bleckley, Robert F. Deniston, Norman A. Graebner, Judith C. Lucas, W. Robert Parks; **Iowa State Teachers College**, Russel C. Calkins, Corley A. Conlon, A. D. Dickinson, Aron Laipple, Katharine Lineberry, Carl B. Nelson, Betty J. Shallenberger, Hazel B. Strayer, Stanley G. Wood; **State University of Iowa**, John P. Hummel, John S. McNown, LeRoy H. Saxe, Jr., Frank D. Sills.

**James Millikin University**, Ralph W. Allan, Max C. Bolen, Clyde A. Dennis, Frank E. Galbreath, Henry J. Keil, Robert Long, Emmaline Rademaker,



Orville B. Shetney, Herbert G. Thompson, Jr., Virginia Weigel; **John Carroll University**, Edward J. Walter; **Johns Hopkins University**, Beulah B. Tatum.

**Kansas State College**, Joye Ansdell, James C. Carey, Ira J. Gordon, Mildred McMullen, Donald F. Showalter; **Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg)**, Phyllis Bate, Lewis H. Caldwell, Lemoine B. Carlyon, Angela de Gagné; **University of Kansas**, William A. Mann, Katharine L. Mix; **University of Kansas City**, G. Georgiades Arnakis; **Kent State University**, Arthur P. Boblett, Ballard Brady, Earle E. Curtis, Elsie Dickert, Hilda Jane Ellis, Jacques J. Engerrand, Hugh A. Glauser, Esther M. Gray, F. Jane Guseman, Frances Harshbarger, Ruth Hoover, Harold Kitner, Robert Morrow, John H. Parks, Matthew C. Resick, Roy E. Wenger, G. Harry Wright; **University of Kentucky**, Robert H. Cojeen, William W. Haynes, Alfred B. McEwen, Dorothy Salmon; **Kenyon College**, Raymond English, Simeon Hutner, Murray Krieger, James E. Michael; **Knox College**, Isaac O. Peterson; **Knoxville College**, Herman J. Kloepper.

**Lafayette College**, H. Knowlton Trust; **Lamar College**, Norris H. Kelton, Floyd Quick; **LaSalle College**, Walter J. Kaiser, James F. Kennedy, Charles P. Perkins; **Laval University**, Maurice Lebel; **Lawrence College**, Richard W. Burnett, William Riker; **Lebanon Valley College**, G. Adolphus Richie; **Lincoln Memorial University**, Floyd Bowling, Jane Lotspeich, Marie G. Meek, Earl H. Smith; **Lincoln University (Missouri)**, Thelma T. Gorham, Ambrose B. Lewis, Gwendolyn T. McDuffie, Rondell H. Rhodes; **Southeastern Louisiana College**, George W. Bedsole, Jr., Wheadon Bloch, Martina E. Buck, Clark Gallaher; **Southwestern Louisiana Institute**, Albert L. Capuder; **Northwestern State College of Louisiana**, Roland Abegg, N. B. Morrison, Charles G. Risher, George H. Ware; **Louisiana Polytechnic Institute**, F. Elizabeth Bethea, W. J. Bordelon, Hoyle E. Brewer, Alma Burk, Merle Burk, Katherine M. Butler, Lucille W. Campbell, Woodrow W. Chew, James W. De Moss, Jr., M. Frances Fletcher, Eugene R. Guintier, Glenn L. Hodge, Ernest C. Jones, Ethel H. Kelly, Kermit Knighton, Lovick P. McLane, Mary Moffett, Margaret F. Newberry, F. Maxine Pepper, Eugenia H. Smith; **Louisiana State University**, Grace D. Bailey, Stevenson Barrett, Alvin L. Bertrand, Ralph Errolle, Peter J. Fliess, Ernest Ikenberry, Blanche E. Jackson, Harold J. King, Robert A. Pascal, Charles A. Reynard, Armin Scheler, Gerhard Singer, Bill B. Townsend, Ina H. Unglesby, Louise Utterbach, Anne Woolfolk; **Loyola University (Illinois)**, Charles W. Anrod, Winifred A. Bowman, James X. Boyle, Jerome Isenbarger, Mariette LeBlanc, Anthony L. Milnar, Donald X. Murray, George R. Pearce, Jr., George N. Thoma, G. Carl Wiegand, Joseph J. Wolff, George H. Zimny; **Lycoming College**, Robert H. Ewing, C. Herbert Picht, Frederick U. Wells; **Lynchburg College**, Pearl G. Griffin, Clyde E. Miller, Allen B. Stanger, John M. Turner, Jr., Walter R. Wineman.

**Madison College**, Raymond C. Dingleline, Jr., Murl C. Shawver; **University of Maine**, Irwin B. Douglass, Samuel J. Mayo; **Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart**, Mother Gertrude L. Buck, Mother Aileen Cohalan; **Manila Central University**, Magdaleno Arellano; **Marietta College**, Frederick H. Jackson; **Marquette University**, Scott L. Kittsley, Clarence R. Wilkinson;

**Mary Baldwin College**, Robert D. Swan; **Western Maryland College**, H. Murley James, Horace Townsend, Jr.; **Maryland State Teachers College (Towson)**, Lois D. Odell; **University of Maryland**, E. James Ferguson, Charles A. Johnson, Harry W. Piper, Irving Rothchild, Jesse E. Smith, Dorothy M. Torpey; **Massachusetts Institute of Technology**, S. Curtis Powell; **Massachusetts State Teachers College (Framingham)**, Stuart B. Foster, Edward Gilday; **University of Massachusetts**, Harold D. Boutelle, Richard M. Colwell, Gordon Donald, Jr., Robert S. Feldman, Albert E. Goss, Bruce R. Morris, Paul D. Ritger, H. Duncan Rollason, Israel H. Rose, Henry H. Skillings, James G. Snedecor, Theodore R. Vallance, Ralph C. Zalkan; **University of Massachusetts (Fort Devens)**, Harry N. Syrene; **Meharry Medical College**, Natalia M. Tanner, Kathryn L. White, Roberta D. Williams; **Memphis State College**, Walker F. Agnew, George W. Boyd, Willie May DuBard, John E. Farrior, Irma I. Greer, A. Peyton Hurley, Charles W. McIntosh, Edna F. Sutton; **Miami University**, William McL. Dunbar; **University of Miami**, Helen G. Bardelmeier, David W. Bent, Robert C. Beyer, Roland G. Davidson, David E. Gibbs, Luellen M. Hauser, Sydney Hordvitz, Joan G. Knoche, Gerrit Schipper, Frank B. Sessa, Hazel Westby, Joseph H. Young; **Northern Michigan College of Education**, Walter H. Schaefer, Martha A. Starr; **Western Michigan College of Education**, Orie I. Frederick, Paul B. Horton, Alice L. LeFevre, Charles A. Smith; **Michigan State College**, Harry C. Beaman, Jr., Maxine A. Eyestone, Harold Hart, Edward C. Long, William H. Loughran, Robert R. Mallory, E. Alwin Parker, William A. Peterson, John H. Woodburn; **Michigan State Normal College**, Virginia A. Cooper, Donald M. Currie; **University of Michigan**, Paul R. Bryan, Marvin Felheim, Sidney Fine, Edward J. Furst, C. Ferrel Heady, Jr., Donald L. Hill, Glen L. Kolb, Wilbert J. McKeachie, William R. Steinhoff, Robert E. Ward; **Middlebury College**, Jean Berger, Kathryn A. Caughran, Viola L. Diebold, Fernand L. Marty, Henry B. Prickitt, Baird W. Whitlock; **Minnesota State Teachers College (St. Cloud)**, Charlotte Curran; **Minnesota State Teachers College (Winona)**, Harold M. Anderson, James M. Becker, Ralph A. Behling, Kathryn Dunlay, Leslie Gage, John Gunderson, Lillian E. Hammer, Grace Hiler, Virginia Richter, Margery Robinson, Ray J. Scarborough; **University of Minnesota**, Jan O. M. Broek, Joseph Carpentieri, Joseph W. Miller, Josephine L. Rollins, Esther E. Shuler, Elmer L. Thomas, Paul R. Wendt; **University of Minnesota (Duluth Branch)**, Leonard B. Wheat; **College Misericordia**, Agnes C. Loughlin; **University of Mississippi**, John E. Phay; **Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy**, Paul G. Herold; **Northeast Missouri State Teachers College**, Otho L. Barnett, John D. Black; **University of Missouri**, Donald B. Clark, Fern W. Smith, Beryl W. Sprinkel; **Montana State University**, Harry F. Adams, Eugene Andrie, Robert P. Armstrong, James L. Athearn, Harlan G. Bower, Paul E. Bruns, Nan C. Carpenter, Linus J. Carleton, Herbert M. Carson, Eugene K. Chamberlin, Edward Chinske, George P. Dahlberg, James E. Dew, Jane P. Duffalo, Leslie A. Fiedler, Harold D. Fleming, Benjamin R. Frost, Edmund E. Jeffers, Roy Mikalson, Kenneth E. Moore, Theodore H. Shoemaker, Agnes L. Stoodley, Leland M. Yates; **Montgomery Junior College**,

William Cohen, Emery Fast, William L. Fox, Sadie A. Higgins, Allen H. Jones, Freda D. Malone, Bernice F. Pierson, Julien A. Ripley, Jr.; **Morehead State College**, Willard A. Ballou; **Morgan State College**, Marc M. Moreland; **Morningside College**, LeRoy B. Nydegger, Sterling E. Stewart; **Morton Junior College**, Robert J. Burke, George L. Royce, Harold J. White; **Mount Holyoke College**, David Hawley, Nadine Shepardson; **Mount Union College**, Robert E. Bader, John B. Bennett, Robert Y. Fluno, Robert O. Juergens, R. Craig Rover.

**Nebraska State Teachers College (Wayne)**, Laura Franklin; **University of Nebraska**, Elvera R. Christiansen, Harold K. Fuller, Wesley C. Meierhenry, Claude E. Rhoad; **University of Nevada**, George A. Broten, Jack B. Grafton, Paul H. Jensen; **University of New Hampshire**, Fred E. Allen, Wilbur L. Bullock, George H. Deming, Thomas A. Jackson, Henry G. Kuivila, David F. Long, Priscilla L. Rabethge, Richard L. Small; **New Jersey State Teachers College (Montclair)**, Frederic H. Young; **Eastern New Mexico College**, William E. Baldwin, Albert A. Bettina, Joe I. Myers, Lorene R. Pope, Ernest A. Propes, E. Debs Smith, Harold I. Woolard; **New Mexico School of Mines**, Blanca Rivera; **New Mexico State College**, Manfred Fliess, Edgar R. Garrett, Arthur Kay, Delilah Manire, William O'Donnell, Sylvan Schendler, W. A. Wunsch; **New Mexico State Teachers College**, Louise L. Chapman; **University of New Mexico**, Robert C. Barnard, Lloyd R. Burley, Dorothy I. Cline, John A. Damgaard, Jr., Kurt Frederick, George M. Hocking, David Kroft, Frances McGill, James H. Miller, Gladys E. Milliken, Sherman A. Wengerd, Joseph E. Yell, Jr.; **Associated Colleges of Upper New York (Champlain College)**, Chris G. Chachis, George V. Edwards, Jr., Delwyn Hyatt; **New York Medical College**, Bertrand E. Lowenstein; **New York State College for Teachers (Buffalo)**, David A. Cappiello, Norman F. Trusedale; **New York State Teachers College (Brockport)**, Clifford B. Wilson II; **New York State Teachers College (Fredonia)**, Grace S. Courson, T. Richard Patterson; **New York State Teachers College (Oswego)**, Rosalie Ihle, Leonard Stavisky, Margaret A. Trippe, Ernest G. Wise; **New York State Teachers College (Plattsburg)**, John W. McTernan; **New York University**, Maurice Baudin, William W. Brickman, E. N. Grisewood, Lawrence Karlin, Howard H. Kendler, Ruth B. Manser, Bernard Mausner, Bernard Schwartz, Robert C. Weaver; **Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina**, Raymond G. Lloyd, Juan F. López; **North Carolina College at Durham**, Christopher C. Handy; **North Carolina State College**, Philip M. Rice; **University of North Carolina**, David G. Frey, Norman W. Mattis, Joseph L. Morrison; **North Dakota Agricultural College**, Margaret Bolin, Robert N. Faiman, Cecil B. Haver, William R. Olsen, Willard D. Pye, Joseph H. Schultz, Mervin A. Tuntland, Robert K. Wattson, Jr.; **North Dakota State Teachers College (Minot)**, Ralph G. Aronstam, Ruben O. Gjerde; **University of North Dakota**, Harry J. Christofers; **Northwestern University**, Dascomb R. Forbush, Don Geiger.

**Occidental College**, Benjamin H. Culley, Norman W. Freestone, Paul B. Johnson, John W. McMenamin, Richard H. Swift, Carl F. Trieb, Ingram P. Walters; **Ohio State University**, Marvin Fox, Julian B. Rotter, A. Wayne

Wonderley, Claude-Starr Wright; **Ohio University**, Eric Thompson; **Ohio Wesleyan University**, Thomas W. Hundermark, William Kosinar, Robert E. Shanklin; **Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Guy R. Donnell; **Southeastern State College of Oklahoma**, George A. Young; **University of Oklahoma**, John N. Alley, Robert E. Bell, Jean Brown, W. Albert Catenaro, Melvin E. Griffith, Lucile C. La Salle, James M. Murphy, William T. Penfound, Lawrence Poston, Jr., Richard Prash, Blanche Ratliff, E. Blanche Sommers, Ruth Spalding; **University of Omaha**, Robert E. Andrews, C. Loyd Shubert; **Southern Oregon College of Education**, John D. McAulay, Breen Ratterman, Theodore G. Schopf, Frances E. Silver; **Oregon State College**, Paul E. Bernier, Edouard Bourbousson, Lawrence D. Coolidge, Dorothy B. Fox, Paul J. Gunn, C. N. Harris, Harold M. Livingston, Charles H. Martin, William A. Nail, Harry K. Phinney, C. V. Plath, Ernest N. Sandgren, Jocelyn A. Skinner, George Ulnic; **University of Oregon**, Vaughn S. Albertson.

**Pennsylvania College for Women**, Marilyn K. Rigby, Mary M. Roberts, James S. Storey; **Pennsylvania State College**, Irene Berg, Jessie Bernard, Enid L. Bever, Paul W. Bixby, Margaret E. Campbell, Howard L. Carnahan, Lee E. Corter, David L. Cowell, Harold U. Crouse, Frank T. Dietz, Norman M. Eberly, Mae I. Fauth, Henry R. Fortmann, Abraham H. J. Goodman, Joseph H. Grosslight, Lester Guest, Oscar A. Haac, Charles B. Haentze, Ronald C. Hoskinson, Floyd A. Hummel, Raymond D. Kennedy, Dagobert de Levie, Anthony S. Luchek, J. Lupton Mecartney, James F. Penney, Peter B. Pfahl, Stephen M. Raleigh, Neal Riemer, Waldemar A. Scheyer, Leonard Y. Shakt, Charles W. Stickler, Jr., Ruth M. Stinemeyer, Richard G. Stoner, Deno G. Thevaos; **Pennsylvania State College (Swarthmore)**, Gordon W. Couchman, Walter L. Ferree, Floyd Gahman, John H. E. Slater; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Bloomsburg)**, John A. Hoch; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (East Stroudsburg)**, J. Leroy Bailey, George J. Bergman, Lily Dale, Simeon L. Guterma, Kurt Wimer; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Indiana)**, Fred D. Berkebile; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Kutztown)**, Horace F. Heilman; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Millersville)**, Louis G. Jennings, James E. Koken, Josef C. Krasley, George E. Leffingwell; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Shippensburg)**, Charles F. Belows, J. Bernard Hogg, Norman E. King, Harold O. Kramer, George W. Reisinger, Erma K. Rolar; **University of Pennsylvania**, Ralph B. Allen; **University of Pittsburgh**, Bernard H. Friedman, Grace F. Marcus, Maurice J. Thomas; **Pomona College**, William J. Newman; **University of Puerto Rico**, Juan H. Sánchez, Oscar Vélez; **Purdue University**, Nestor Bohonos, Robert L. Platzman.

**Reed College**, Kenneth E. Davis, Edwin N. Garlan, Arthur G. Kogan, Stanley Moore; **Rhode Island State College**, Constance L. Brine, Henry Capasso, Frederick Caro, Spencer Davis, Beverly M. Downing, Nancy C. French, Alfred L. Gadrow, Harold E. Graves, George R. Griffin, James F. Grove, Robert S. Haas, Shubel C. Haley, Ernest W. Hartung, John L. Hummer, Melvin Lindner, Rowland H. Mayor, George W. Phillips, Eleanor L. Robinson, John B. Rowell, Stanley B. Smith, Arline Tilton, Herbert Wiener,

Richard D. Wood; **Ripon College**, Paul J. Aldus, John W. Graham; **Rockford College**, F. Darline Hannabass; **Rollins College**, Rudolph Fischer, Horace A. Tollefson; **Roosevelt College**, Marian A. Despres, Albert Halasi, Oswald Jonas, Esther G. Liberman; **Russell Sage College**, Jean Moe; **Rutgers University**, Joshua Barlaz, Fred G. Fender, Henry J. Frank, John J. George, Mason W. Gross, Robert N. Grosse, Hovhaness Heukelekian, Ridgeway Hoegstedt, John P. Newton, Malcolm S. Robertson, Joseph L. Slater, Andrew M. Tully, Charles Wahl; **Rutgers University (Newark Colleges)**, Morton J. Hellman, Kurt Mayer.

**St. Francis Xavier College for Women**, Oscar W. Perlmutter; **St. John's University**, Eugene Germino, John J. McCarrick, Louis B. Plaut, John M. Sledz; **St. Lawrence University**, Garry M. Brown, Margaret Doucoumes, Lawrence B. Hixon, Carleton P. Jones, Jr., J. Kenneth Munson, Fred J. Parrott, Myles W. Rodehaver, Freda L. Townsend, Roswell G. Townsend, Robert J. Wright; **St. Louis University**, Frederick Gormley; **St. Michael's College**, William N. Campbell, Edward J. Pfeifer; **College of St. Thomas**, John D. Asselin, Frederick E. Flynn, Julius S. Gassner, Mary M. Keefe, James C. McGraw, Franz H. Mueller, Timothy O'Keefe, Frank E. Ransom, Roman R. Sevenich, Raphael G. Thuente; **San Bernardino Valley College**, H. Duane Anderson, George F. Beattie, William F. Brenizer, Henry W. Schlag, Thurston B. Swartz, Beatrice White; **San Diego State College**, Hannah W. Ball, Fred F. Harclerod; **San Francisco State College**, Jordan Churchill, James G. Cooper III, George R. Dietz, Gertrude Luehning, Jack Patten; **San Jose State College**, H. Murray Clark, Mabel G. Crumby, Arthur C. Kelley, Paul M. Roberts; **University of Scranton**, John E. Bourne; **Colleges of the Seneca**, Olivia H. Coolidge, Lindsay Lafford, Daniel J. Petrizzi; **Seton Hall College**, Ralph F. Becker, Joseph F. X. Cunningham, Jerome E. MacDonald, Victor A. Mahoney, Paul M. Ochojski, Lawrence G. O'Connor, James J. O'Donnell; **Seton Hill College**, Josephine Ferris, Edda Hankamer, Jane D. Meyer, Shurtleff College, Mary Boyce, Paul G. Brewster, Leonie Hunter; **Simmons College**, Raymond F. Bosworth, David P. Edgell, Leonard Silk; **Skidmore College**, Arthur H. Dohlstrom; **Smith College**, Herbert A. Clark; **University of South Carolina**, Ruby M. Ott, Alfred Rawlinson, Thomas W. Stokes, William Y. Wagener; **South Dakota State College**, Gerhard J. Falk, Raymond J. Greb, Daniel E. O'Connell, William H. Richardson, William M. Rogoff, Victor S. Webster; **University of South Dakota**, Arnold C. Anderson, William Bender, Kenneth R. Berquist, Harold N. Carlisle, Sherwood P. Cummings, Charles R. Estee, William T. Gleason, Alexander P. Hartman, Francis W. Haskell, Inez L. Hollingsworth, Irene Hunt, Robert H. King, Keith J. Nighbert, Bernard D. Perkins, Leonard A. Poth, Kenneth E. Raschke, Theodore W. Ripper, Earl B. Scott, Edwin H. Shaw, Jr., Everett W. Sterling, Francis J. Streim, Hulda Vaaler, Arthur A. Volk, Russell C. Waters, Alvin L. Wilson; **University of Southern California**, Lewis M. Headley, George W. Kalionzes, Irving R. Melbo, Laurence E. Morehouse, Carl A. Neidengard, R. Vance Presthus, Clarence K. Sandelin, James C. Warf; **Southern Methodist University**, James T. Carlyon, Ira G. Corn, Jr., Wesley C. Davis, Fred D. Gealy, Glen C. Hoskins, A. W.



Martin, Willis M. Tate; **Southern University**, Gertrude C. Bazil, Harrison D. Lawless, Jr., Esther C. Toms; **Southwestern College**, Blaine B. Nolan; **Springfield College**, Edward J. Smyke; **Stanford University**, Felix Bloch, Frederick A. Fuhrman, Meyer A. Girshick, Monroe J. Hirsch, William J. Iverson; **Stout Institute**, Dwight D. Chinnock, George A. Soderberg; **Susquehanna University**, Thomas F. Armstrong, Jr., Spence T. Marks, Milton F. Stancati; **Sweet Briar College**, Abraham Kreusler; **Syracuse University**, Mary N. Alexander, George F. Anderson, Philip B. Armstrong, Charles E. Baker, John J. Barron, Martin E. Barzelay, Peter G. Bergmann, Herbert W. Berry, Sylvia G. Berry, Lipman Bers, James H. Birnie, Ruth E. Bonner, Willis R. Boss, Edna P. Brandau, Dean C. Broughton, Marjorie Burns, Harold H. Chang, David K. Cheng, James A. Close, Arthur W. Combs, Catharine E. Condon, William P. Converso, Henry F. Cooke, Gladys E. Cooper, Harold S. Corey, Burton B. Crandall, Edward W. Cundiff, Leonard Dauenhauer, Theodore C. Denise, Duane Doolittle, Helen A. Dunning, Raymond T. Entenmann, Melbourne G. Evans, William Fleming, Richard A. Frank, Ralph A. Galbraith, Irene C. Garrett, Ruth Gauger, Phyllis B. Gilmore, Harry E. Goheen, Jean L. Goodall, Martin A. Greenman, Armine Gulesserian, Oscar Harkavy, John W. Harriman, Frederick Haucke, Judith Heckelman, Robert L. Hess, Harry H. Hilberry, Morris C. Hill, Paul W. Hirseman, Marjorie K. Horton, Ramon L. Irwin, Frederic Jackson, Joan Jacobson, Dorothy L. Jirsa, Maurice Johnson, Russell F. Kaiser, Henry M. Kendall, William C. Klaila, Jr., Paul R. Klohr, Irving Korobkin, J. Curry Lamar, Earl S. Lamm, Barbara Lancey, Melvin Lax, Eric W. Lawson, Murray G. Lawson, Wilbur R. LePage, Henry Levinstein, Mary A. Lewis, Charles Loewner, Russell L. Loftus, Eleanor A. Ludwig, Charles D. Luke, Don W. Lyon, R. Jane McDonald, Mary F. McFeeters, Douglas L. Mather, Nollie B. Messer, Ralph E. Montonna, Kathryn Morgan, William O. Munroe, Maria C. Murray, Ordean G. Ness, Carroll A. Nolan, Bert H. Norem, John F. Olson, Robert F. Oxnam, C. Robert Pace, Channing Pao, Mignon Pellegrin, Igor Plusc, Merlin F. Pollock, Murray H. Protter, Ruth H. Randall, Phoebe E. Regan, J. Stuart Rich, Frederick Schweppe, Samuel Seely, Anne N. Simmons, Kurt Sitte, Robert L. Smith, James P. Soffietti, Leah A. Strong, Ralph O. Swalm, Alfred W. Swinyard, Aldrich Syverson, D. Burnham Terrell, John W. Trischka, Richard Trumbull, George J. Vander Sluis, Abraham Veinus, Alice Weschke, Francis A. Wingate, Edmund H. Woolrych, Henry C. Youngerman, William Zelermeyer.

**Taylor University**, Florence M. A. Hilbish; **Temple University**, Virginia D. Austin, Nye W. Griffiths, Robert E. Reuman; **Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State College**, Iola E. Lewis; **University of Tennessee**, William K. Baker, Joseph H. Clark, Allen H. Keally, John E. Keller, Clarence E. Kuhlman, Priscilla Lantz, Walter B. McGuffee, Robert R. Newton, Frances A. Schofield, Mahlon L. Townsend, William Way, Jr., Jack H. Wilcox, Margaret Wyman, John T. Zumbro; **Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas**, Marvin H. Butler, Albert W. Crain, Kenneth A. Fugett, B. A. Hardaway, Richard B. Rypma, Andrew E. Salis, William E. Schenk, J. George H. Thomp-



son; **Texas College of Arts and Industries**, Charles O. Vandervoort; **Texas College of Mines and Metallurgy**, John M. Sharp; **Texas State College for Women**, Madison L. Marshall; **East Texas State Teachers College**, Roy J. Johnson, Dean Lowman, Everett M. Shepherd; **North Texas State Teachers College**, Henry Dannelley, Carlis C. Davis, Thomas S. Harlee, Thelma R. Newman, Anna I. Powell, James J. Spurlock, Robert B. Toulouse; **Texas State University for Negroes**, James M. Gaither, Vivian W. Goodson, Bessie F. Naves, James B. Oliver; **Texas Technological College**, Earl D. Camp, F. Annette Ocker, Margret Stuart, G. Frederick Warn; **University of Texas**, Benjamin M. Bakkegard, Violet A. Earle; **University of Toledo**, Carroll E. Amos, Herman D. Bloch, Eugene W. Clehouse, Mary F. Hunter, James E. King, Charles H. Larwood, Paul F. Munger, Marian Myers, Edith Osswald, John W. Parsons, John C. Rishell, Sidney M. Robbins, George N. Webb, Kenneth A. Weller; **Tufts College**, William B. Baker, Jr., Shepard Bartnoff, Robert K. Craven, John Hicks, James R. Strawbridge; **Tulane University**, Abram Amsel, John H. Dent, Donald L. Fabian, Frank P. Gatling, Beverly Jackson, Henry H. Mamet, Dorothy Myers, Louise Nisbet, Wilson L. Taylor, Rex C. Wilder, William S. Woods; **University of Tulsa**, Clyde Blanchard, Raymon C. Ingram, Ed. H. Johnson.

**Union College and University**, Clare W. Graves; **United States Naval Academy**, Edward J. Goodman; **Upsala College**, Harold R. Sandberg; **University of Utah**, Adrienne Buck, Enrique C. de la Casa, Maria-Luisa G. de la Casa, Guy E. Smith, Eleanor Volberding.

**Villanova College**, Joseph J. Gilligan; **Virginia State College**, Roy W. Watson; **Virginia State Teachers College**, Robert T. Brumfield; **Virginia Union University**, Dorothy A. Lewis, Harry M. Linnette; **University of Virginia**, Robert K. Gooch, Gordon T. Whyburn.

**Wake Forest College**, Charles M. Allen, A. Lewis Aycock, Sankey L. Blanton, Dalma A. Brown, John A. Easley, Edgar E. Folk, Roland L. Gay, Hermon M. Parker, Clarence H. Patrick, Kenneth T. Raynor, Budd E. Smith; **Washburn Municipal University**, Harold E. Conrad, Everett Fetter, Sadie E. Hall, Mildred E. McKee, Ruth Parker, William F. Seigle, Esther H. Vanderlas; **Washington College**, Mary E. Massey; **Central Washington College of Education**, Wilhelm Bakke, Lewie W. Burnett, Ruth H. Windle; **Eastern Washington College of Education**, Henry A. Bamman, Mable L. Pearson, T. Earl Tilley; **Western Washington College of Education**, Herbert R. Hearsey, James H. O'Brien; **Washington and Jefferson College**, Kenneth F. Wieand; **State College of Washington**, David D. Delafield, Emma E. Harris, John R. McHenry, Barbara A. McLaren, H. Delight Maughan, Hazel C. Murray, Marion Ownbey, Frances Sadoff, Frances S. Stiles, John R. Ulrich, Jr., Allen I. White; **Washington University**, Frank S. Noble; **University of Washington**, David H. Garber, Boris A. Jacobsohn, Abraham C. Keller, Robert J. Lampman, Reinhardt M. Rosenberg, Lyle W. Shannon, George E. Taylor; **Wayne University**, Donald G. Castanien, M. Frances Estep, David A. Hilton; **Wellesley College**, S. Orville Baker, John L. Bradley, Jan La Rue, John R. Williams; **Wesleyan College**, Ruby W. Lafferty, Herndon Wagers; **West**

**Virginia University**, Thomas C. Campbell, David W. Northup, Donald W. Olmsted, Ruth Seligman, J. Clifford Stickney, Rebecca Wade; **West Virginia Wesleyan College**, Roland P. Rice; **Western Reserve University**, Donald E. Becker, John R. King; **Westminster College (Missouri)**, Leif C. Dahl, Maurice B. Finch, Robert G. Hoerber, David Horton, Charles W. Steele, Henry T. Westover; **Westminster College (Pennsylvania)**, Ann S. Jones; **Whitman College**, David B. Schaub, Edward G. Watson; **Whittier College**, Aubrey R. Bonham, Alexander De Conde, Wallace J. Newman; **University of Wichita**, Roland O. Byers, William E. Nagel; **College of William and Mary**, Barbara H. Kalif; **Wisconsin State Teachers College (Milwaukee)**, Maxwell M. Freeman; **University of Wisconsin**, Constantin N. Apsouri, David F. Kahn, Robert W. McGilvery, Mark A. Stahmann; **Wittenberg College**, Emmett T. Bodenbergh, Paul R. Brees, Everett H. Bush, Ruth Cowdrick, Harold B. Fortney, Ruth Helsel, G. Vernon Kelley, W. Douglas Larson, Benjamin H. Pershing, Clarence K. Schultz; **College of Wooster**, Robert B. Grape, Edward W. Huffman, Norman Knox, Paul B. Modlish; **University of Wyoming**, Virginia K. van Benschoten, Merton Bowling, William H. Clohessy, William Drake, J. Thomas Field, Edwin G. Flittie, Lawrence E. Fouraker, Guy P. Franck, Agnes G. Gunderson, Charles D. Heaton, John M. Hill, George E. Hollister, Hans S. Joachim, Emil Kauder, Eugene O. Kuntz, Joseph T. Langland, Eric J. Lindahl, Robert R. McCollough, Paul O. McGrew, Dorothy L. MacMillan, John K. Mathison, William T. Mulloy, Rebecca Raulins, Joyce M. Reed, E. George Rudolph, Louis C. Rus, Robert I. Russin, Frank J. Trelease, Daniel W. Tuttle, Rebecca Vaughn, Ralph M. Wade.

**Xavier University**, Richard E. Tontarski.

**Yale University**, John P. Miller; **Yankton College**, Matthew Faithe

### *Transfers from Junior to Active*

**Baylor University**, Sue Moore; **Central State College**, Nelson Klose; **University of Georgia (Atlanta Division)**, Henry G. Baker; **University of Pennsylvania**, Albert I. Oliver, Jr.; **University of Western Ontario**, Albert L. Hilliard.

### *Junior*

**Boston University**, Donald E. Schein; **University of Buffalo**, Arthur L. Kaiser; **University of California**, Afife Sayin; **University of Cincinnati**, Jerome Richfield; **Cornell University**, James L. Brewbaker; **Drew University**, John M. Vayhinger; **University of Hawaii**, Robert H. Horwitz; **Southern Illinois University**, Ruth Haddock; **Iowa State College**, Grace I. Glenn; **University of Kansas**, Verna I. Marceau; **Loyola University (Illinois)**, James H. Fleming, Donald A. O'Grady, Ann O'Reilly; **Michigan State College**, Julietta Smith; **University of Michigan**, James A. Evans, Cameron W. Meredith, Daniel E. Neville, José R. Ortiz, Carlos A. Soares, Francis R. Young; **University of New Mexico**, David DeCamp; **University of North Carolina**, Hans Freistadt; **University of Pennsylvania**, Philip L. Rizzo; **Syracuse Uni-**

versity, Joseph Baron, Edward H. Meyer, Margaret B. Watson; Temple University, Milton Chorvinsky; University of Tennessee, John F. Spangler; University of Texas, Sumner Ives; Tulane University, Margaret L. Cuneo; State College of Washington, Lester T. Brown, Margaret V. Schroeder; Not in Accredited Institutional Connection, Anton A. Berle (M.A., New York University), Baltimore, Maryland; Edwin M. Faust (M.A., Columbia University), Montgomery, West Virginia; Raymon C. Forston (M.A., Columbia University), Fort Worth, Texas; Ethel Frazier (Graduate Student, University of Pittsburgh), Waynesburg, Pennsylvania; George P. Freeman (M.A., Columbia University), Montgomery, West Virginia; James B. Jennings (M.A., Illinois State Normal University), Lebanon, Illinois; Sheldon Peterfreund (Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania), Boston, Massachusetts.

## Academic Vacancies and Teachers Available

To assist in the placement of college and university teachers the American Association of University Professors publishes notices of academic vacancies and of teachers available. It is optional with appointing officers and teachers to publish names and addresses or to use key numbers.

Letters in reference to announcements published under key numbers should be sent to the Association's central office for forwarding to the persons concerned. Address in care of the General Secretary, American Association of University Professors, 1101 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

### Vacancies Reported

Political Science: One-year appointment, substituting for member of department on leave of absence. American Government and Politics. Middle salary bracket; two-thirds or full-time position. Address applications to Professor Emmett E. Dorsey, Chairman, Department of Political Science, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

### Teachers Available

Administration, Academic Dean, Biological Science: Bachelor of Pedagogy degree (state teachers college), A.B. (church college), A.M., and Ph.D. (state university). Administrative experience: department head, director of summer teachers college and biological station, college dean (state school—2000 students). Upon the amalgamation of two state schools (1948), this dean chose to prepare for further administrative work by full-time teaching contacts in a large college. Numerous publications. Listed in *Who's Who in Education*, *American Men of Science*, *Who's Who in America*, etc. Good speaker, dynamic personality. Very sympathetic with the common man. Will consider junior college with possibilities. May be released at close of any term up to October, 1950. A 3329

Biology (Zoology, Embryology, Ornithology, Heredity): B.Pd., A.B., A.M., Ph.D. Wide experience as teacher, department head, and director of biological station. Publications, *Who's Who*, etc. Can be released at close of any quarter up to October, 1950. A 3330

Chemistry: Mature woman, single. Ph.D. Over 20 years of teaching experience; desires position as head of science department of small liberal arts college. Experience includes: science-teachers-training, prenursing, nutrition, dietetics, general science, and biological science introductory courses. A 3331

Chemistry—General or Organic: Man, 50. B.S., M.S., Ed.D. Desires position in teachers college, or teaching and supervision in city school system in Northeast or West. Publications. Speaker. In city schools and college 20 years. Good reason for change. A 3332

Economics: Man, 35, married. M.B.A., University of Texas, 1942. Near Ph.D. 3 years' college teaching experience and 15 years' experience with business and government organizations. Held positions of Transportation Economist with National Resources Planning Board and Board of Economic Warfare; 4 years' practical experience in air transport operations. Equipped both by training and

experience to offer full programs in transportation and international trade or economics, also interested in teaching elementary economics, and business, and government. Available immediately. A 3333

Engineering (Management, Industrial, and Civil): Registered Professional Engineer (Civil and Industrial): Man, 44, married, children. Member of leading professional societies; listed in *Who's Who in Engineering*. Teaching interests are: human relations; human engineering; engineering administration; city and regional planning; engineering law; contracts and specification writing. Invites correspondence regarding position as professor, department head, or dean of engineering. A 3334

Engineering Drawing, Descriptive Geometry, Mathematics: Man, single. B.A., B.F.A. in Arch. Engineering. Engineering taken at Columbia, Michigan, and Harvard. Residential periods of study at Oxford and Heidelberg Universities. Extensive experience in teaching in large Eastern universities. Well acquainted with leading texts and up-to-date methods. Extensive foreign travel. Member of leading professional societies. Listed in *Who's Who in Engineering in America*. Desires college, university, or junior college position in Eastern United States. A 3335

English: Man, 48, married, 1 daughter. B.S., M.A. 25 years' teaching experience, 10 years in college English. Specialty: composition. Has also taught: technical writing; business English; English literature; American literature; modern drama; romantic poets; oral English; art history and appreciation. A 3336

English: Man, 45, single. Ph.D. in English, Cornell. 1 book shortly to be published by a university press. 12 years of university teaching experience. English Composition; English Literature: Survey, Romantic and Victorian periods, Wordsworth, Arnold; Literary Criticism; Great Books; World Literature. Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi Scholarship, Fellowship. Travel. Large private library. Available immediately. A 3337

English: Woman. M.A., academic and scholastic honors. 3 years' teaching experience, 2 in New England colleges of high standing. 3 years as secretary in large business concern. 1 year editorial experience and writing. Two volumes of published poetry. A 3338

English: Woman, 47, one dependent. Ph.D. 11 years' experience. English survey; romantic; American literature on undergraduate and graduate level. Creative writing. Publications. Book in progress. American Philosophical Society Fellowship. East or Midwest. A 3339

English, Literature and Language: Man, 45, single. Cornell Ph.D. Experience: 20 years, 19 of them in 4 Eastern universities. Specialties: English language, especially modern and American; linguistics; 19th century and American literature; composition. Research, publications: English language, lexicography; books, many articles, verse. Experienced editor. *Who's Who in America*, etc. Full or associate professorship, \$3900-\$5000, in nonurban liberal arts college or state university. Available fall, 1949. A 3340

French, German, also Italian, possibly chairmanship of Department of Modern Languages: Man, late forties. Ph.D. European studies. Experienced teacher; publications. Widely travelled. A 3341

German: Man, 48, German-born, American citizen. "Security clear," with OSS during the war. Ph.D. and equivalent of M.A. from German university; 10 years' successful teaching at U. S. universities; also holds Junior College Teaching Credential. All courses in German language and literature, including Scientific German, Drama, and Lyrics. Author of plays, verse, and essays. Extended foreign travel; excellent references. Not interested in stopgap positions. Available fall, 1949. A 3342

- German, French, Italian, Latin: Woman, German-born, U.S.A. citizen. Staats-examen, Munich University, Diploma from University of Paris, M.A. and Ph.D., Columbia. Long teaching experience; widely travelled. At present teaching foreign languages in a junior college; seeking advancement. Position desired in college or university. Available now. A 3343
- German, French, Spanish: Woman, 39. M.A.; Ph.D. in progress. Long teaching experience in Europe; 2 years' American college. Seeks permanent position. Available fall, 1949. A 3344
- German and Humanities: Mature man. Ph.D., magna cum laude. 13 years of teaching experience in American colleges. ASTP. Specialty: veterans' readjustment. Available after June, 1950. Teaches also courses in Comparative Literature. A 3345
- German, Latin: Man, married, Protestant. Ph.D., University of North Carolina. Three degrees in Latin and German. 1 year of concentration on German at Yale; 2 years' European residence and study, chiefly at Munich and University Goettingen. 10 years' teaching all levels Latin and German, including scientific. Speaks German fluently. Desires placement September, 1949. A 3346
- Guidance, Counseling, or Personnel: Woman in early thirties. B.S., Wayne University; M.S. in Student Personnel, Syracuse University; course work completed for the Ed.D. in Personnel, Counseling, and Guidance at Syracuse University while teaching and counseling in reading, learning, and study skills and directing a counseling program at the Psychological Services Center. Teaching and counseling experience at both high school and college levels. Excellent recommendations. Pi Lambda Theta. Available fall, 1949. A 3347
- History: Man, married, 2 children. Ph.D. Professor in Midwestern college with 14 years' teaching and administrative experience. No possibility for advancement in present position. Would like departmental headship in undergraduate college or professorship in university with opportunity for graduate teaching. Fields: American, Canadian, British, and Far Eastern histories. Have published articles and reviews and am finishing a book. Have done extensive public lecturing. To be included in next edition of *Who's Who in America*, *Who Knows* and *What* and am already in several educational *Who's Whos*. Available summer or fall, 1950. A 3348
- Music: Man, 33, married. B.S., M.A., Ph.D. American, now teaching at large Canadian university (associate professor) wishes to return to teaching in United States. 7 years' experience at university level teaching musicology, composition, history, harmony, counterpoint, etc. Instruments, violin and viola. Conducting experience. A 3349
- Political Science: Man, 36. M.A., and additional graduate study. 10 years' teaching experience. Available September, 1949. A 3350
- Sociology: Man, married, 4 grown sons. Ph.D., 35 years of teaching experience as professor of sociology and social work, in liberal arts college, and very recently, professor emeritus. Special fields: family relations, race relations, and industrial relations. Practical experience in administration; public representative on War Labor Board panels; in charge of institutes on family life education. Author. Listed in *Who's Who in American Education*. Phi Beta Kappa and membership in professional organizations. Excellent references. Desires one or more years appointment in teaching as substitute for professor on sabbatic leave or in administrative work. Available in fall, 1949. Willing to consider any location. A 3352
- Speech and Drama: Man, 27, veteran, married. B.A., M.A. and additional graduate study. 3½ years' college teaching experience. Have taught all types speech and drama courses. Primary field in play direction, both amateur and professional. Available, September, 1949. A 3353